

AN
EXPOSITION
OF SOME
Articles of Religion,

which strike at the
Tenets of the *Arians* and *Socinians*.

Likewise at the
Infidels, Romanists, Lutherans and *Calvinists*.
In Several
Sermons and Dissertations.

- I. Of Faith in the Holy Trinity.
- IV. Of the Resurrection of Christ.
- V. Of the Holy Ghost.
- X. Of Freewill.
- XVII. Of Predestination and Election.
- XXII. Against Worshipping and Adoration of
Images.
- XXV. Of the Sacraments.
- XXVIII. Of the Lords Supper
- XXXIII. Of Excommunicated Persons.

By GEORGE ADAMS, M. A.

L O N D O N:

Sold by J. Clarke, the South-side of the Royal-Exchange;
Mr. Johnson, at the Golden-Ball, the North-side of St.
Paul's Church-Yard; and W. Owen, at Homers-Head,
Temple-Bar., 1752.

EXPOSITION

Articles of Religion



OF THE
ARTICLES OF RELIGION
OF THE
CHURCH OF ENGLAND
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF SCOTLAND
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF IRELAND
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF WALES
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
SHETLAND ISLANDS
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
FAROE ISLANDS
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
AZORES
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
CANARY ISLANDS
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
MADAGASCAR
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
SEYCHELLES
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
REUNION
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
MARTINIQUE
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
GUADALUPE
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
ST. PIERRE
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
MICHIGAN
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
ONTARIO
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
QUEBEC
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW BRUNSWICK
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW SCOTLAND
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW JERSEY
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW YORK
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW HAMPSHIRE
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW ENGLAND
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW FRANCE
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW SPAIN
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW MEXICO
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW CALIFORNIA
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW TEXAS
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW ARIZONA
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW MONTANA
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW WYOMING
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW COLORADO
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW NEVADA
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW UTAH
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW IDAHO
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW WASHINGTON
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW OREGON
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW CALIFORNIA
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW TEXAS
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW ARIZONA
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW MONTANA
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW WYOMING
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW COLORADO
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW NEVADA
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW UTAH
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW IDAHO
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW WASHINGTON
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW OREGON

OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW CALIFORNIA
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW TEXAS
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW ARIZONA
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW MONTANA
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW WYOMING
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW COLORADO
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW NEVADA
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW UTAH
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW IDAHO
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW WASHINGTON
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW OREGON

OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW CALIFORNIA
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW TEXAS
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW ARIZONA
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW MONTANA
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW WYOMING
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW COLORADO
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW NEVADA
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW UTAH
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW IDAHO
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW WASHINGTON
AND
OF THE
CHURCH OF THE
NEW OREGON

—

DOCTISSIMO PRÆSULI
REVERENDO ADMODUM

I N

CHRISTO PATRI,

A C

DOMINO DNO
THOMÆ LONDINI EPISCOPO,

H O S

ECCLESIÆ ANGLICANÆ ARTICULOS.
SERMONIBUS AC DISSERTATIONIBUS
ILLUSTRATOS.

SUMMÆ OBSERVANTIÆ
QUALECUNQUE PIGNUS AC MONUMENTUM,

OFFERT

CONSECRATQUE
GEORGIUS ADAMS.

DOCTISSIMO PRAESENTI
REVERENDO ADMODUM

CHRISTO PATRI

DOMINO
THOMAE LONDINI EPISCOPO

ECCLIASTICAE ANAE ARTICULOS
SERMONUM IN DISSEMINATIONIBUS
ILLUSTRATOS



SERMONUM OBSERVANTIA
QUALITATUM HONORIS AC NOMINIS

OFFERT
CONSECRATIQUE
GEORGIUS ADAMS

Domine Reverendissime

QUOD *Articulos Ecclesiæ Angli-
canæ quosdam, Sermonibus meis
Ecclesiasticis, & Dissertationibus il-
lustratos, nomini tuo dedicare Au-
deo, ne indigneris obsecro. Id utique
me agere præsumo, quod non Solum
mea in te pietate dignum sit, sed et
officii rerum que mearum ratio postulet.
quum enim jam per viginti, et quod
excurrit annos, in tua hac Diœcesi sacro
munere perfunctus sim, quo tempore non
nulla Laboris mei Monumenta in Lucem
ediderim, hoc inter cætera munuscul-
um, siquid Secum frugis ferat Maxime
tibi consecrandum a me esse existimavi.
cujus enim sub tutela, tale prodiret opus,
nisi ejus qui ejusdem Ecclesiæ Gard-
ianus, & Episcopus sit? & optime
me itaque fecturum esse reor, Siqua
par est animi Submissione, id nunc tibi
offeram, ut hoc fidei meæ illibatæ, et
ad normam purioris illius, quæ et anti-
quior est, Compositæ, Studii que, quod
in*

Domine Reverendissime

*in excolenda Sanctiore doctrina hac-
tenus collocavi, publicum tibi consti-
tuam documentum.*

*Quod ut benigno vultu respicias gra-
tioseque adprobes, est quod Submissa
animi veneratione plurimum expeto.
Quod restat DEUM O. M. Supplici-
prece invoco, ut in te Reverendissime
Domine, omnem veræ felicitatis Copiam
effundere, votis que TUIS eo cum eff-
ectu annuere ex alto velit, quo & tui
Clerique cui præsides, Ecclesiæque nostræ
salus Servetur inconcussa, & bonæ literæ
disjectis præjudiciorum ignorantiaque
tenebris, boni mores, veraque Stabi-
lita pietate Secundo semper exoptatoque
futorum fluxu promoveantur.*

24 OC 62

Tibi Devotissimus.

Ad LECTOREM

PRÆFATIO,

QUOS exponimus, fidei, & Religionis Articulos ii sunt, de quibus longas cum Dissidentibus hæreticis, Infidelibus aliisque Christianismi Adulteratoribus, Controversias nexuerunt Orthodoxi; quibusdam, qui Christiani dici volebant, Sed in diversa abibant, Ecclesiamque Christi infausto Schismate Scindebant. Hanc ob rationem, ad causam fidei nostræ agendam, aliquando videamur necessitate quadam adstricti esse. Compescendis itaque his Schismatibus, Sæpius subinde gliscentibus Unitati que inter Christianos tamdiu desideratæ optatæque restituendæ, Seposito partium Studio, & Sincero veritatis amore adducti manum admovimus.

Hæc itaque, nos optime facturos esse arbitramur, Si hos Articulos, juxta Sacræ Scripturæ normam, Ecclesiæ primitivæ reformatæque fidem Sanctorum ejusdem Patrum Judicio, ac testimonio firmatam exponamus. Hunc in finem, hos Sermones ac Dissertationes edidimus. Sermonem primum quod attinet, nos Scilicet plures Deos Statuere, vel Dogma nostrum contradictionem implicare, nobis objiunt Sabelliani, nisi ut unum Deum ita et unam quoque Personam Solummodo esse cum iis credamus,

Ariani itidem eadem nobis impegerunt, nisi filium Dei inferioris Patre naturæ esse, at-

que

que unitatem Dei servari in sola Patris personâ per Superiorem quandam & originariam potestatem, Sibi propriam, cum his asseramus.

Ast non opus est ut huc confugiamus, qui ab hac æque ac ab illa hæresi abhorreamus, & tres Personas ejusdem substantiæ, Potentiæ Gloriæ & Majestatis, Naturæ Divinæ ejusdem Consortes esse juxta Scripturas Statuamus; et adprobendam hanc doctrinam, aperta Scripturæ verba allegavimus, eandemque vetustissimos, Ecclesiæ Patres tenuisse citatis ipsorum dictis Doxologiisque antiquissimis, adeo luculenter probavimus, ut nihil clarius esse posset. Unde vero genuinus Scripturæ sensus petendus est, nisi ex antiquioribus Patrum Scriptis venerabilem primorum Seculorum ætatem ferentibus? In secundo itidem Sermone; eodem fere tramite perreximus, ad exponendum Articulum decimum ejusque confectarium decimum septimum; quos ea propter in Discursum unum collegimus, cujus pars prima probat facultatem quandam habere humanum genus, ut turpia fugiat honesta Sumat, aliter nec qui malus est puniri juste nec qui justus est remunerari potest, tamen post lapsum Adæ, absque gratia divina, ipsum præveniente ad voluntatem suam excitandam, & adjuvante ad omne bonum opus faciendum, ad pietatis opera facienda quæ Deo grata sunt et accepta nihil valere. In posteriore vero non ulterius progredimur quam sacre Scripturæ nobis prælucent quæ, ut Calvinii Sententiam deprædestinatione

atione et Electione absoluta apertè improbant, ita veritatem utriusque Articuli abunde probant. Ast haud de profundo hoc mysterio nimium disputare licet, ne in præfractam in rebus divinis determinandis audaciam dilabamur; tum quod de Naturæ operibus dicitur, sapientiam ejus esse inscrutabilem, viasque ejus non explorandas. *Rom. 11. 33.* hoc quoque Mysteriis gratiæ aptari potest, de quibus tutissimum est nobis silentium imponere, contentis eis quæ nobis revelata sunt ut omnia verba legis ipsius faciamus. *Deut. xxix. 29.*

A Sermonibus, ad Dissertationes progredimur, quarum primâ, Articulo quarto de Resurrectione Christi, fides adstruitur, ac proinde Dogmati, ab ipso prolato, idque ex tantis, actualibus Testimoniis, quibus, siqui fidem detracturi Sint, Religionemque suam veram, optimamque non crediderint, præsertim consideratis intrinsicis ejus veritatis testimoniis, necesse est aliam quam probationis penuria, infidelitatis Causam habeant, cum eaquæ adduximus Argumenta, tam multos probos, eos demque sapientes in Assensum traxerint, scilicet quod nolint ab iis abduci quæ corpori placent, quò eos adduceret Christi Religio, nec verum videri id quod adfectibus suis adversatur. Hic obiter ea nobis refellenda sumimus, quæ ab anonymo quodam allata fuisse noveramus, sed Argumentis tam invalidis, ut facilis oppido nobis eorum extiterit refutatio: Ad quam addo quod qui Filium verum & Æternum Deum,

juxta Articulum secundum esse crediderit, facile huic Articulo credat ; ei enim haud mirum vedebitur, mortuo vitam reddi posse, præsertim ejus efficacia, qui vitam primum homini dedit, nec proinde Christum in vitam seipsum resuscitare potuisse. Cæterum dum mentionem Arianorum hic injicimus, observandum est, eos plurimum argumentis infidelium, sive Deistarum subservire ; viamque ad omnem morum improbitatem, & Atheismum restringere falsis, nempe quorundam Scripturæ textuum explicationibus, aliosque rejiciendo, qui eorum hæresi videntur esse contrarii, sic Deistæ eos sibi Amicissimos esse scirent. Nam cum sub specie religionis se ipsi religioni opponant pravi homines, ut eò magis simplicioribus imponere possint, Scripturæ auctoritatem elevent, præcipuam Christianismi partem abrogent, neque aliud ad totam ejusdem abrogationem efficacius esse possit, hinc ab Arianismo facile transitur ad Deismum, hinc ad Atheismum, inde in perniciosam impurissimæ vitæ securitatem, quis enim fræna *libidini*, injiciat qui neque præmia neque pænas post hanc vitam esse credat?

De Coena Domini Articulo, 2870.

late egimus, ubi à primis Christianismi fontibus exorsi, per omnia fere Secula ivimus, & quid a Christo institutum & factum, quid a veteribus superadditum, quid a recentioribus mutatum fuerit, prout res tulit, enarravimus, quo facillime posset a nobis inquisitione facta veritas aut falsitas alicujus Doctrinæ in ipsius insti-

P R Æ F A T I O. 11

inſtitutione fundatæ detegi. Unde apparebit, Eccleſiam Anglicanam, neque Lutheranorum, neque Calviniſtarum, neque Romanenſium, ſed veram Chriſtianam Doctrinam de Euchar- iſtia tenere. Quod inſtitutum, cum ſine re- futatione diſſentientium haud exſequi poſſemus, primum ea nobis refellenda ſumimus, quæ a Boſſueto Epifcopo Meldenſi ad ſacrificium Corporis & ſanguinis Chriſti in Euchariftia ad ſtruendum; allata fuiſſe noveramus, ubi quæ- dam iis repoſuimus, qui Concilii Florentini de- ciſa contra Græcos conati ſunt defendere, aſſer- entes è diametro contra historicam veritatem, quod Græci in hoc Concilio aſſeruiffent; con- ſecrationem juxta ſententiam Eccleſiæ Ro- manæ, non per *ἐπίκλησιν* ad ſpiritum ſanctum, ſed per verba inſtitutionis, a ſacerdote in Per- ſona Chriſti prolata perficiendam eſſe. De- inde Georgii Hickeſſii S. T. P. argumenta, ex ſcripturis Canoniciſ veteriſque Eccleſiæ monu- mentis pètita, ad ablationem panis & vini ad ſtruendam diſſolvimus. Hinc progredimur ad refutandas, per Euchariftiæ Doctrinam, Gnoſ- ticorum, Cerinthii; Hebionis, & Marcionis, hæreſes; illorum carnis Reſurrectionem negan- tium, duos Deos, Supremum Patrem, & Mundi Fabricatorem eſſe aſſerentium; Fili- um, & Verbum prioris incarnatum fuiſſe neganti- um; alterius vero, aſſumſiſſe, aut ſibi uniſſiſſe Verbum divinum, Sed nudum hominem & tantum ex ſemine David, non Dei filium con- ſtituentium Jeſum. & Marcionis, Domini

12 P R Æ F A T I O.

Nostri humanitatem negantis; ipsumque merum Phantasma fuisse, qui sub Specie humani Corporis populis imponeret, asserentis.

Hæc insequitur Dissertatio, in qua hunc Ecclesiæ Romanæ errorem, summatim pertrinximus, ejusque summam impietatem, brevissimis tetigimus, nempe, sacerdotem à Christo, peccata peccatoribus remittendi Potestate judici-ali & absoluta instructum esse, idque Exhomologesi ei factâ, nullâ veræ, & sinceræ poenitentiae supposita Conditione; quæ cum Dei Solius sit peccata remittere, eaque juxta suam promissionem, non nisi vere pœnitentibus, credentibusque remittat, neque alia conditione quam poenitentia vel impenitentia hominum peccata vel remisserint vel retinuerint Christi Apostoli idque ahunde probaverimus, ut impia falsaque Doctrina sit necesse est.

In quibusdam tamen rebus confessionem peccatorum, Ministro Christi commodam esse admittimus, eo fine, ut declarativam saltem, & conditionalem absolutionem ab eo recipiant, poenitentes non eo sensu, ut pro Sacramento, ad salutem necessario Sumatur. Clavium vero potestatem quod attinet, peccatores scilicet ex Ecclesiæ pomerio excommunicandi, vel poenitentes in idem recipiendi, eam ad Christianorum coetus, vel potius, ad personas Ecclesiastico regimini præpositas, Episcopum, vel eum cui potestas Episcopalis delegata est, ex Christi & Apostolorum præscripto pertinere, argumentis firmissimis probavimus adeo ut quid nobis regeri possit non video.

Id

Id unicum solummodo restat, de quo Lectorem monitum velimus, cum omnis omnino Articulorum usus sit, ad consensum in vera Religione inter Christianos formandum, Dissensumque tollendum ; ita hi Articuli legitime & sincere intellecti, quin hunc habeant usum, impossibile est, idcirco his explicandis operam navavimus.

Quæ huic opellæ finem imponit historica narratio est, de Patrum Judicio in Controversiis recentioribus determinandis, cujus in tractatione, eandem viam ingredimur, quæ præcedentium fuit, ita ut plura hic addere non sit necesse. Pærfationique nostræ hic finem ponimus, qui Lectorem in rem præsentem sumus deducturi.



The first of the three volumes of this
series is devoted to the history of the
United States from the discovery of
America to the present time. It is
written in a simple and straightforward
manner, and is intended to be a
useful and reliable source of information
for the general reader.

The second volume is devoted to the
history of the United States from the
discovery of America to the present
time. It is written in a simple and
straightforward manner, and is intended
to be a useful and reliable source of
information for the general reader.

The third volume is devoted to the
history of the United States from the
discovery of America to the present
time. It is written in a simple and
straightforward manner, and is intended
to be a useful and reliable source of
information for the general reader.

24 OCT 62



S E R M O N

The F I R S T

The Doctrine of the Holy Trinity explain'd.

JOHN v. 7.

For there are three that bear Record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost : And these three are one.



THE principal Doctrine taught in this Chapter by the Evangelist, is that Jesus Christ the eternal Son of God is God and Man, and that he really suffered Death for the Redemption of all Mankind, intended chiefly in Opposition to the Heresie of the Visionaries, who asserted that he suffered in Appearance only, but had no real Body, and having shewn the Benefits of such a Belief, which are the Victory over the World

World, and the Baits and Pleasures of it on the one Hand, and Immunity from Temptations by way of Persecution on the other ; he then proceeds to a Description of the Messiah, expressed in his coming by the Water and the Blood, which issued out of his Side at his Crucifixion, which were Emblems, signifying his Innocence of Life, and Patience in his Sufferings and Death ; and thereby setting him before us as a Patern for one Imitation whom every one who truly believes, must expect to follow in Holyness of Life, and through all the thorny Paths of Persecution and Trouble.

By the Spirit in the 6th and 8th Verses we are to understand, either the same which he commended into the Hands of his Father when he gave up the Ghost upon the Cross ; saying, Father, into thy Hands I commend my Spirit, which Sense of the Word seems to be countenanced by the Word *ἁγιον*, Holy, being omitted in both these two Verses, but inserted in the 7th Verse ; Or, if we take it to mean the Holy Spirit, in Verse 7th. then we shall understand him likewise (because joined with Water and the Blood) as a Witness of his Innocence and Sufferings.

This last Sense of the Word seems to be grounded upon other weighty Reasons.

1st. Because the holy Spirit descending and lighting on him as a Dove at his Baptism, with Water, did testify to his Innocence, and likewise

wise furnish him with the Gift of Miracles, by which the Truth of his Doctrine was established ; 2ly. And likewise descending on the Apostles, did convince the World of Sin, in crucifying him, and him of Righteousness, because by the Spirit of God he was raised from the Dead.

The principal Thing being now proved in the 6th Verse, *i. e. The Messiahship of Christ*: He again proceeds to prove the same Thing which he had proved before, repeating, and appealing to the same Witnesses, with a Paralel between the earthly and the heavenly, by Way of Oppositor, to illustrate what he had proved before, signifying, that what he had proved is as evident by the three Witnesses in Heaven, as the aforementioned Witnesses on Earth : For, saith he, there are three that bear Record in Heaven, *The Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one*, and to answer in the Opposition, *And there are three that bear Witness on Earth, the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood, and these three agree in one* ; that is, in one Testimony, to wit, that Jesus is the Son of God, the principal Doctrine intended to be taught.

Here it is proper that I should observe the most absurd Opinion of some, *i. e.* that no more is affirmed of the Heavenly Witnesses, than is of the Earthly, *i. e.* that they agree in one as if we were obliged to take the Paralel between both the two Verses in every Circumstance, then which nothing can be more ridi-

culous; for, indeed, the Apostles Design, is served as well, if we restrain it only to the Number of Testifiers, and the Nature of the Testimony, and not suppose it to intend that Unity of Nature in one Opposite which is in the other.

Besides, if no more is meant by *ἐν ἑαυτοῖς*, are one, than is by *εἰς τὸ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς*, they agree in one, 'tis very probable that it would have been so expressed, and not in a more obscure Manner than it is of these in the 6th Verse who had been plainly declared to agree in their Testimony; this is he that came by Water and Blood, not by Water only, but by Water and Blood, and it is Spirit that beareth Witness, because the Spirit is Truth.

As much, therefore, is affirmed of both as the Matter will bear, *i. e.* The three on Earth are Testifiers to the same Matter to which the others are; tho' they be not, as they are, one by a Unity of Nature: It hath been likewise objected, that in some of the most antient Copies of the *Greek* and *Latin* Bibles, the Verse of the Text is wholly omitted, and in some, Part of the 8th Verse. For some Copies only read, *There are three that bear Witness, the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood.* In answer to which, not to mention, that it is but within these two last Centuries that any Scruple was made about the Omission of it, when it happened not to be in some MSS. which were not looked into. I shall

shew

shew, that the Omission of it might easily have happened, and actually did in those Copies where it is wanting, either through Mistake or Fraud ; and that in these where it is, it could not be added either Way.

The 7th and 8th Verses beginning with the same Words in the Greek *τῆς εἰς οὐρανὸν* *ἡ* *ὕδατος* *καὶ* *τοῦ αἵματος*. There are three that bear Witness, or Record : 'Tis an easy Matter, when a Transcriber had written the Words in the Beginning of the 7th, by taking off his Eye, to skip to the 8th and write what immediately follows those same Words there, the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood. The other Omissions in the 8th Verse, in Earth, and these three agree in one, are consequent on the former ; being Paralels to those which were omitted in the 7th, in Heaven, and these three are one, and omitted on Judgment, as those to which they answered in the Paralel were through Mistake.

But if this had not happened, the Truth of the Reading is evident from the Testimonies of the Fathers who lived long before the Council of Nice, when the Arian Heresie was condemned ; when there was no Dispute about the Words, and in particular of St. Cyprian, who made use of it as a Testimony of Scripture, when having spoken of St. John, he cites those Words of his : *Dicit Dominus, ego et Pater unum sumus, & iterum de Patre filio, & spiritu Sancto dicit hi tres unum sunt.*

The Lord saith I and my Father are one. And again, of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost he saith, and these three are one : Whereby it appears that it was in all the Copies of the *African* Churches to his Time, the Bishops of which did actually cite the Testimony of *St. John* in these Words. It was always read as a Part of the Scripture both in the *Greek* and *Latin* Churches ; and *St. Hierom* asserts the Truth of the Reading from all the Copies that he had, tho' both he and *St. Ambrose* assert that it was erased out of the Bible to serve the Purpose of the Hereticks.

Moreover, the Omission of the Verse was much more serviceable to the Hereticks, than the Addition could possibly have been to the Orthodox, for, supposing the Words to be true, it leaves those without any Excuse who disbelieve the *Doctrine of the Trinity, in Unity* ; and supposing them to be Suppositions, and which could not possibly happen through any Mistake,

The Orthodox had no such need to forge them; having had several other Texts to prove the Doctrine of a Trinity of Persons in the strictest Unity of the same divine Nature Besides this as will appear in the following Discourse, wherein I shall endeavour to prove the Truth of it by Arguments drawn, 1st. From the Old Testament, the Opinions of the ancient *Jews*, the Testimonies of Christian Writers and Heathens : 2dly. From such Passages in the

New Testament as relate first to all the three Persons in common ; or 2dly. to each Person in particular : 3dly. From the Sense of the Church, as expressed in her antient Doxologies ; 4ly. I shall prove that it is not liable to the Charge either of Contradiction or Impossibility : And, 5thly. That there is no manner of Objection against it in point of Reason.

1st. I am to prove it from the Old Testament and the Opinions of *the Jews and Heathens*.

“ The antient *Jews* had a Notion among
 “ them, of three distinct Subsistences in the
 “ Deity, suitable to those of Father, Son, and
 “ Holy Ghost ; among the three Subsistences
 “ in the *Mercavah* (which * *Rittangel* hath
 “ proved from their most antient Writings) those
 “ which are added to the first, are Wisdom
 “ and Intelligence ; and this last is by the old
 “ *Chaldee* Paraphrast, rendered שְׁכִינָה *Sche-*
 “ *inab*. And he proves it to be applied to
 “ God, in many Places of the Pentateuch,
 “ where such Things are attributed to him as
 “ belong to the Holy Ghost ; and he parti-
 “ cularly shews by many Places, that the
 “ *Schecinah* is not taken for the divine Glory,
 “ but that is rendered by other Words (how-
 “ ever the Interpreters of the *Chaldee* Para-
 “ phrast having rendered it so) but he pro-
 “ duces

"duces ten Places where the *Chaldee* Paraphrast uses it in another Sense. §

The first Proof among the *Jews* is the frequent Mention of God with a Noun in the Plural Number by a Verb in the Singular as *Elohim* *discreavit*, they, the three, one God created*. The *Jews* were extremely jealous as to joining any of the Creatures with God in what related to divine Worship, yet in their most antient Books and the *Chaldee* Paraphrast, which they believed to have been written by inspiration, they own'd three Substances in the same Divine Essence.

And in the Book of *Jezirah* alleged to have been of so great Antiquity, that it was written by *Abraham* before God spake to him, the three Substances in the Deity are represented by Mind Word and Hand, although the Doctrine of the Trinity is the chief Offence which the *Jews* take at the Christian Religion. But this notion they had by a Tradition of the divine Being and the Substances in it, or else it must be supposed, that the latter *Jews* forged these Books on purpose to insert such notions as were most grateful to their enemies, and hateful to themselves; (which no body of understanding

§ *Stillingfleet's Vindication of the Trinity.* 203. 204. *Gratius de ver. Christ Relig.*

* Lib. v. 1. 21. § Gen. 1. 1, Deut. 6. v. 4. *Josh.* 24 v. 19.

understanding can imagine they would do) and That this is true Scripture Doctrine, we have the Testimony likewise of several famous Defenders of our Religion; who though they own'd there was a distinction between them yet they made none in that Worship, which they rendered to them, which plainly proves, that they, admitted of an equality, in Dignity, Power and God-head in the three distinct Persons of the Trinity, in the same Divine Nature; and that the manner of this Union and distinction, being at present incomprehensible, it will be what all Christians shall aspire after in another Life, that they shall know the Union and the Communication of the Father to the Son; what the Holy Ghost is, and what the Union and distinction is between the Holy Ghost the Son and the Father.

Among the Heathens *Plato* had his three Principles, which he distinguish'd by the Names of Essential Goodness, Mind or Son of God and Holy Spirit, which Doctrine he learned of the *Hebrews* while he resided among them, and so built his School upon the same Foundation upon which *Christ* built his Church; so that both *Jews* and *Gentiles* prepared the Way for the reception of Christianity, and made that Divine Revelation more easy to be believ'd and acceptable when it was revealed.

2dly. The Texts in the New Testament where the three Persons are mentioned in Common, are the Antient Form in Baptizm, instituted

instituted and prescribed by our Saviour, for the use of the Church; *Mat 28. v. 19. Go teach all Nations, Baptizing them in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.* From whence each Person being mentioned as the Object of our Faith, without any Marks of Distinction and inequality, we have a Proof that each Person is God, and then comparing this with *Eph. 4. v. 4. 5. 6. One Spirit, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptizm, one God and Father of all:* where one Spirit, one Lord, one God and Father of all being set Paralel to the one Baptizm we have a full Proof from hence that one Supreme Essence or Godhead does Subsist in the Trinity of Persons spoke of in Baptizm, and in which we are to believe. Therefore as *St. Cyprian* observes, this Form was prescrib'd that it should be administred, *in plena & adunata Trinitate.* in the full confession of the Faith of the Trinity, in the first Ages of the Church, the Validity of the Form of Baptizm was reckoned to depend upon the Faith of the Trinity, and those who were to be admitted to it, were to be first examined, and instructed in this Doctrine; this Faith was the main Point required in order to a true and legal Baptizm; insomuch that some have imagined that if the Persons Baptized were found in that, although all the three Persons were not named, the Baptizm was good, but without it, there could be no true Baptizm.

“ But when I speake of this Doctrine, I
 “ would be understood as speaking of a Trinity
 “ wherein

“ wherein the Divinity of the Son and Holy
 “ Ghost is Maintained, as well as that of the
 “ Father ; not of a Trinity of mere Names and
 “ Cyphers, or, of one God and two Creatures,
 “ which some have falsely set up, as appears
 “ by some of the Antient Fathers so vigorously
 “ opposing those who held that Doctrine

Tertullian says, that Father Son and Holy Ghost are one by a Unity of Substance, State and Power, which he else where calls a Monarchy ; this may be lodg'd in distinct Persons and administred says he by many ; but speaking of the Form in Baptizm, he says, *ad singula nomina, in Personas singulas tringimur*, at every name, we are baptized in the Faith of every Person.

“ Whereby it is plain, that he understood
 “ the Unity of Substance, in the three distinct
 “ Persons, distinct as to their personal Properties,
 “ Capacities and Relations, external Dispensations
 “ or Oeconemy ; and that without division of
 “ Essences, or separate Substances. ”

This he says is no new Doctrine, but what came from the rule of Faith, delivered in the beginning of the Gospel, before *Praxeas* his Opponent, or any other of the former Hereticks his Predecessors.

Novatian and *St. Cyprian* assert the same Doctrine, and add that those who denied the sense of the Church in the earliest times in relation to this form as *Noetus* and *Sabellius*, who held but one Person, as well as one God, were cast out of the

Church's Communion. So that the mean between those who held three different Principles, and so made three Gods and those who confounded the Persons, was that one Supream Essence, divine Nature or Godhead whom we own and worship, does Subsist in three Persons. *i. e.* the Divinity of the three Persons in the Unity of the divine Essence.

2dly. That solemn Benediction used by the Apostle *1 Cor. xiii. v. 14. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost.* Where all the three Persons in the Trinity are severally prayed to; *viz.* God the Father for his Love, God the Son for his Grace, and God the Holy Ghost for his Communion, or Communication of saving Benefits, or liberal Effusion of Gifts.

3dly. That historical Passage concerning our Saviours Baptizm, *Mark. i. v. 10. 11. And straightway coming up out of the Water, he saw the Heavens opened, and the Spirit like a Dove descending upon him; and there came a Voice from Heaven saying, Thou art my Beloved Son in whom I am &c.* So likewise *Mat. iii. v. 16. 17.* upon which Passage St. Austin Comments thus, "*Pater auditur in voce, filius manifestatur in Homine, & Spiritus sanctus dignoscitur in Collumba.*" The Father is heard in the Voice, the Son is manifested in the Man, and the Holy Ghost is discovered in the Dove,

" And

“ And *Athanasius* exhorts those who doubt
 “ of the Truth of this Doctrine, to go to *Jordan*
 “ and there be convinced of it; and indeed with
 “ just reason, for no proof can be more plain then
 “ the distinction here between the Spirit descend-
 “ ing and resting upon *Jesus*, the Father whose
 “ Voice proclaimed him his Son, and that Son
 “ himself whom this Spirit rested upon, and to
 “ whom this Voice bore Testimony. ”

I proceed now to consider such Passages in
 proof of it, as relate to each Person in particu-
 lar, and first the Divinity of the second Per-
 son the Son, and his Coeternity with the Father,
 are asserted in *Chap. the 1st of St. Johns*
Gospel v. 1st: In the Beginning was the Word
and the Word was with God, and the Word,
was God. i. e. the same God with whom he
was. Which may be compared with Prov. viii.
v. 22. therefore St. Paul calls him the first
born of every Creature, or rather according
to the Original, born before all Creation,
i. e, before any Thing was Created; therefore
he must be the one Eternal God, and 1 Tim.
iii v. 16. he says God was manifested in the
Flesh. Rom. xi. v. 5. that Christ is over all,
God blessed for ever. and Heb i. v. 8. he as-
cribes Eternity to him saying, thy Throne O
God is for ever and ever. and with St, John
i. v. 3. Col. i. 16. the whole work of the
Creation to him who is called Heb. i. v. 10.
Psal. cii. v. 24. Jehovah, St. John an Equal-
ity of Honour with the Father. v. 23. and 1
John

John. v. 20. calls him the true God, *we are in him that is true, i. e.* in the true Father by being in his Son *Jesus Christ* who is the true God, calling whomsoever denies him to be the Son of God in this Sense a Lyar and Antichrist. *John. v. 18.* although the *Jews* denyed his, Divinity, they acknowleged from his many expressions of himself that he made himself equal with God ; hence *St. Paul* says of him *Phil. ii. v. 6. that he thought it not robbery to be equal with God.* Lastly his Omniscience may be proved from the following Texts compared together *John. xvi. v. 30. 21. 17. Jer. xvii v. x. John. ii xxiv. Act. i 24. Heb. iv. v. 12. 13. &c.*

“ And although some Moderns have asserted that the word God is not in the original in the before cited Text * in the most ancient Bibles, but was afterwards added ; or that it is not to be understood of Christ but of God the Father, yet the most subtil of the ancient Hereticks never maintained this bold assertion or presum'd to turn the Words of *St. Paul Rom. ix. v. 5.* into a thanksgiving to God for the exaltation of Christ, of whom as concerning the Flesh Christ came, *who is over all God blessed for ever. ”*

3dly. The

* *Rom. 9. v. 5.*

3dly. The Names, Operations, Attributes and Properties, of God are given to the third Person in the Trinity, *Act* v. 34. where *St. Peter* tells *Ananias*, that by *Lying to the Holy Ghost* he had not *Lyed unto Men, but unto God.* where he is said to intercede for the Saints *Rom.* viii. v. 27. *to be sent by the Father in the name of Christ* *John* xiv. v. 26. *to receive of Christ's and shew it unto others* *John* xiv. v. 14. *1 Cor.* 3 v. 16. where Christians are said to be the *Temples* of God because the *Temples of the Holy Ghost*, where he is joined with God the Father, who will not impart his Glory to another, as an object of Faith and Worship in Baptizm, and the Apostolical Benediction.

The Blasphemy committed against him is said neither to be forgiven in this World, nor in the World to come; which, although it be not therefore unpardonable, because he is God; yet unless he were God it would not be unpardonable.

Lastly. *1 Cor.* xii. v. 11. The holy Spirit is said to Work and to Divide to every Man severally as he will. And in the Words before the Text the Apostle having said the *Spirit is Truth.* (which was giving him a Title, common to God the Father and to Christ,) reconciles it by declaring presently that the Father Word and Spirit are one equally Truth itself. *

3dly. My

* See Dr. *Waterland's* Importance of the Doctrine Chap. vi. p. 269

3dly. My third Argument is from the Ancient Doxologies universally received from the Time of the greatest Antiquity into the Offices of the Church, *Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost.* St. Basil mentions one that runs thus *We render thanks to him who gave our Lord Jesus Christ to be a Saviour, to whom with the Holy Ghost be Glory and Majesty for ever.* Another is to *God the Father and his Son our Lord Jesus Christ with the Holy Ghost be Glory and Power for ever and ever Amen.* To the same Purpose are those Doxologies of Polycarp at his Martyrdom for Christianity, and of Pionins the Martyr, mentioned by Eusebius in the 25 Chap. of his fourth Book, which we can never suppose these Men would have used, who had rather die, than give divine Worship to Creatures, if they had not believed the Doctrine as here laid down.

In all those Doxologies, an equality of Honour is apparently rendered to all the three Persons in the Trinity, which must imply an equality in Dignity : From whence it is plain that the Christian Church doth, and always in the earliest Ages of it did maintain, three distinct Persons in the same divine Nature with an equality of God head.

4thly. I come now to prove that there is niether Contradiction or Impossibility in this Doctrine.

When

When we are discoursing of this so Sublime a Myserie we must consider it as actually revealed by God, and that he may require our assent to any Doctrine revealed by him, as the Object of our Faith, although it be above the Comprehension of our Reason. And,

The Doctrine of the Trinity being this that there are three Persons in one common nature, it is a quite different position from asserting three in Number to be one, or one three, because, we assert the Trinity to be three in a quite different view from that in which the three Persons are asserted to be one. For according to the Scriptures *Deut. vi. v. 4. Mark xii. v. 29.* there is one God and none else, and yet mention is there of a Communication of the divine Essence, from the Father to the Son, and from the Son to the Holy Ghost, as hath been proved, the *Greek Church* chose to express those different relations by the name of *Hypostases*, and the *Latin* by the Word *Person*, by which we understand a compleat intelligent Being, Essence or Substance, with a particular different mode of Subsistence; or some incommunicable Properties; whereby it is distinguished from all others of the same Nature; which Word applied to finite limited Creatures, must separate them into so many individual Substances: But as God is one Simple, compleat absolutely perfect Being, and as the Attribute necessary existence belongs to him, that must exclude from him every thing inconsistent with
itself

itself. And when we speak of three Persons in the God head, we must be understood in such a Sense as excludes every thing inconsistent with those his infinite Perfections, and Attributes of *Æternity* and necessary existence; but no objection can be taken from the Notion of God, to overthrow a Trinity of coexisting Persons in the same divine essence.

For necessary existence implys an *Æternal* coexistence of those divine Persons who Subsist in it, and the Unity of the Essence implys that no such difference of individual Substances can be in the divine Nature, as there is amongst Men. For in the Deity there can be no Diversity of Accidents or Substantial difference to make Individuals, or of Place, or Qualities, no separate Existence, Gods Essence being the same with his Existence necessary is not contingent, or dependent on the will of an other, as all Creatures are. We may suppose more or fewer of them, without Alteration of the Essence. But any more than one absolutely compleat and Perfect, Independent, Self existent, eternal Being, necessarily existing cannot be; because one is sufficient for all Things and Purposes whatsoever: therefore more, is contrary to the Attribute of necessary existence; for all but one would be Superfluous needless and unnecessary, and need not be, then if all but one, why not as well that one, they being supposed in all things perfectly alike; then there would be no Necessity at all for the
the

the Being of a God ; and yet it is granted on all Hands, that necessary existence is essential to the Notion of a God. since only one necessarily exists, and necessary existence is essential to the Deity, therefore if but one God be necessary, there can be no more.

And the same individual Essence makes an indivisible Unity : or a close and indissoluble Union *of three Persons in the same Essence,* But no incommunicable Properties of Persons in the same individual Essence can make different Individuals therein ; for such an Essence is capable of Division, cannot make an indissoluble Union.

While we consider such a Being, we ought to observe such a Distinction of Persons in the same common Nature, as to avoid the Error of the *Sabellians*, who held but one Essence and one Person, likewise sustaining three Manifestations, Names or Appearances.

When therefore we say the Father is God the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God ; and yet there are not three Gods, but one God, they do very unjustly who charge us with the Contradiction of saying that three are one, or one three ; because we assert each of the three Persons to be God in a quite different view from that in which the Godhead is said to be one. *i. e.* the Trinity is not one and three in the same Respect, but in a quite different one. For when we say that the Father is God, the Son God and the Holy Ghost God, we deny that

E

there

there are three Gods, or that three Gods are one God ; but we say that the divine Nature is communicated in an ineffable Manner from the one Person to the other, so that each Person of himself is God, but as to the Relation which he bears to the other, is Father, Son and Holy Ghost ; and they are all one in respect of the divine Nature or God head, of which they equally partake.

St. Austin clears this Matter by a very familiar instance, *De Trin. Lib. 5. Cap. 3.* The Father as to himself is God, but as to the Son he is Father, the Son as to himself is God, but as to the Father, he is the Son. But how is it possible to understand this ? why saith, he take two Men, Father and Son ; the one, as to himself is Man, but as to the Son, a Father ; the Son, as to himself, is a Man, but as to the Father, he is a Son : But these have the same common Nature.

And the Scriptures which assert the Unity of the Godhead, ascribe to each of the three the same divine Attributes, Operations and Worship, therefore there is no distinction, or variety in their Godhead, *

The Word which the Antients used in their disputes with the *Arians* to express the Divinity of Christ, by shewing that of he was of the same Substance

* See *Stillingfleet on the Trinity.*

Substance with the Father, was ὁμοούσιον. Consubstantial ; but as this Term may be taken in a larger Sense than they intended, even to comprehend individuals of the same Kind, as amongst Men ; they took care to assert a perfect Unity and indivisibility of the divine Essence, but such as the Nature of Man is incapable of ; but in their other expressions, took care to guard themselves from *Sabellianism* on one Hand, which confounded the Persons, and from *Polytheism* or, *Tritheism*, which divided the Substance, both which they equally abhorred.

Asto the Charge of *Polytheism*, *Athanasius* observes that all Mankind was reckoned as one, because they have the same Essence ; and if it be so in Men, who have such a difference of Features, of Strength, of understanding and Language, how much more may God be said to be one, in whom is an undivided Dignity, Power, Council, and Operation. But lest they should be thought by this, to admit of such a difference and division in the Godhead, as Subsists in individual Men, who notwithstanding this indivisibility of the common Essence, are actually divided according to the individual Properties belonging to them. They asserted that in the Trinity there is a conjunction without Confusion, and a Distinction without division,

“ And so perfect an Union that it is so
“ undivided and united in itself, that where

“ ever the Father is, there is the Son and the
 “ Holy Ghost, because there is but one God-
 “ head, and one God, *who is over all, and*
 “ *through all, and in all* ” (hence our Saviour
 says, *I am in the Father, and the Father in*
me, and the Father dwells in me. John xiv.
10.) not by such a local inexistence, as there
 is between Bodies mixed together where must
 be distinct Substances ; but by such and in-
 divisible and ineffable Unity, that one cannot
 be without the other, that God is the Father
 of his Son, ἀμεστωσ indivisibly so taking the
 Term ὁμοῖος of the same Substance to si-
 gnify an indivisibility of the divine Nature,
 either in itself, or in any other consideration
 whatever, and in particular that of Man’s Es-
 sence being divided in is several Subjects, into
 distinct Essences called by some ταυτοτης τῆς
 φύσεως the sameness of the divine Nature. But
 least they should thereby, seeme to destroy
 the divine *Hypostases*, or Persons they asserted
 a distinction in the *Hypostases*, and yet no di-
 vision in the Subjects, *i. e.* Individuals ; but
 did not deny such a difference, as was founded
 on their mutal Relation to each other, and
 manner of Subsistence, or, πῶς διαφορεῖν κα-
 τὰ τὸ αἰ ἰόν καὶ ἀνίστατον.

And in order to prove this distinction be-
 tween the divine and human Persons, say they
 among Men, if several go about the same
 work, yet every particular Person works by
 himself; and therefore they may well be called
 many,

many, because every one is circumscribed ; but in the divine Persons, it is quite otherwise, for they all concur in the Action towards us : And again' that God is not one in number of which he is incapable, but in Nature ; for number they reckoned to belong only to compound Beings, which are not really and simply so many, but each one of it is compounded, as we say of the World.

Thus *St. Basil says*, God is a simple uncompound Being, and therefore, cannot be said to be one in number, but the World is not one by Nature, because it is made up of so many Things, but it is one by number, as those several parts make but one World.

I come now to prove 5thly. That there is no Objection against this Doctrine in Point of Reason.

If we take Reason according to some Moderns, for the Perception of the Agreement or Disagreement of our Ideas of things ; and the Faculty of the Soul of Affirming or Denying, according as it discovers them by the use of intermediate Ideas, to agree or disagree ; this cannot discover the certainty of any Thing dubious or Obscure, by comparing it with some thing evidently known, unless we could have a clear and distinct Idea of that dubious or Obscure thing we pretend to the certainty of, when the only way to attain this certainty, is by comparing these Ideas together : But we may be certain of the Mysteries of our Faith

Faith, and of many other things, of which we cannot have clear and distinct Ideas. Our certainty of this Mystery by Reason thus considered, depends upon our having a clear and distinct Idea of Substance, Person, and the Distinction between them.

“ But if we can have no such in our Minds
 “ concerning these things, as are acquired by
 “ by sensation or Reflection, *i. e.* the Intromission of our Senses, or by the souls considering its own Operations about what it thus gets from without concerning them
 “ as Knowing, Doubting, Affirming, Denying,
 “ &c. which are the sole matter and foundation
 “ of all our Reasoning, but such only as are imperfect and no intermediate Ideas ; ” then this comparing these together cannot be the Means, of certainty or the Foundation of our Reason concerning these Things, being not intromitted by the Senses, nor depending on the Operations of the Mind: nor consequently of the certainty of this Mystery.

There are many Things with which we daily converse, whereof we have no clear and distinct Perceptions; and yet we may be certain that they really exist, otherwise we could not be certain that there are either Bodily or Spiritual Substances. By reflecting on

on the Powers in ourselves, which we discern of knowing, willing, and considering; and by the Operations and Properties, which cannot Subsist of themselves, we come to be certain that there are both Bodily and Spiritual Substances though we can have no clear and distinct Ideas of those Powers and Properties, which we could not be if our Reason depended upon those Ideas; muchless according to those who say, that for any Thing we know of these Substances the Almighty may as well add to Senseless matter the Faculty of thinking, as he can add to it a spiritual Substance with that Faculty. As to the manner of the Operation both of Material and Immaterial substances we are intirely ignorant; and the most inquisitive have confessed, " That the very notion of Body
 " implies something very hard, if not im-
 " possible to be explained, or understood by
 " us and that the natural Consequence of it
 " *viz.* Divisibility, involves us in Difficul-
 " ties impossible to be explained, or made
 " consistent. That we have but some few Supe-
 " ricial Ideas of Things; that we are destitute
 " of Faculties, to attain to the true Nature of
 " them and can discover nothing farther, but our
 " own Blindness and Ignorance. "

As to the manner of the Operation of Second causes how they depend upon one another, and all upon the first, we are wholly Ignorant. That we ourselves do exist, we are certain from our own Perceptions; but how the invisible hand

hand works in our formation we know not : How God certainly fore knows future events, which depend upon contingent causes, how he knows what his Creatures certainly will do, we yet see in themselves a freedom to do otherwise ; how motion is Communicated by impulse and thought are, and must remain inexplicable difficulties to us. And yet if we are certain of these, as none can deny, and yet are uncertain of the manner of their Operation ; how senseless is it to reject any revealed Doctrine which relates to an infinite *Æ*ternal, incomprehensible Spirit, because we understand not the manner of its existence.

But less reason have we if we consider we are as ignorant of the Nature of other divine Attributes, as we are of the Doctrine of the Trinity ; for instance of Gods *Æ*ternity, and the Degrees of his other Attributes ; his Power, his Knowledge, his Will, which as they belong to him, are infinite, and above our comprehension.

In a Word, we discover very little of the most common things but their Powers and Properties, and can have no distinct Ideas of their Essences ; how great a Madness then must it be in us to reject divine Mysteries, because they are incomprehensible.

St. Paul exhorts *Timothy* to hold the Mystery of Faith in a pure Conscience, which is the same with the form of sound word he had heard of him : We see they are called
sound

found Words, tho' the Doctrines contained in them were reckoned Myfterious and incomprehensible.

In that form of found Words, there is no doubt but the Trinity and Incarnation were comprehended, for, *St. Paul* calls the latter exprefly the *Myfterie of Godlinefs*.

I fhall only make an application of *what has been faid, in a few fhort Admonitions*.

1st. To the adverfaries of this Doctrine. Let them not imagine that upon the grounds upon which we receive it, we give way to the Entertainment of any abfurd Opinion, or overthrow the ufe and certainty of Reason; for we allow of the ufe of it, in examining whether any Doctrine be truly reavealed by God or not, and when we are fully affured that it is, Reasons affifts us in examining whether we interpret the Senfe of the Words aright, which relate to fuch *Revelation*, by examining and comparing Copies and Tranflations, with each other; and comparing them with the Originals; efpecially the Senfe of the Church of Chrift in the beft and pureft Ages, neareft the Times of the Apoftles, and exprefsed in folemn and publick Acts; and if we find the Doctrine to be really revealed in fuch a Senfe, although it fhould be above our comprehension we have no more power to reject it on any fuch pretence as that it is fo, than we have to reject the Scriptures themfelves, or the divine Attributes, or, other things, becaufe they are fuch.

F\

But

But when any Doctrine is pretended to be revealed, which is contrary to the evident principles of Sense and Reason, we must conclude, that the several Passages of the Scripture, which are brought to prove it, ought to be taken in a different signification from any, which seems to give countenance to the belief of such a Doctrine. Mean while Humility and Modesty in them, some diffidence of themselves, and of the reach and compass of their own understandings in this dispute; some check upon the excursions of human Fancy, some degree of deference to the Judgment of others, to publick decision, and the opinion of the World, [to which some kind of Veneration is certainly due,] some acknowledgement, that if they trust to themselves that they are *Christ's*, that we may be so too, a readiness of Mind to receive conviction, a serious and fixed regard to the Oracles of Truth, with a Submission to them of each favourite conceit, and darling notion, are the proper dispositions to prepare them for * casting down Imaginations, and every high Thing which exalteth its self against the knowledge of God and bringing into Captivity every thought to the Obedience of *Christ*.

2dly.

* ii Cor. x. 7. 5.

2dly. Let us take heed that no seducing Spirit corrupt us in this Article of our Religion, concerning the blessed Trinity ; for when ever we part with it, we shall at the same Time surrender not only our Creeds, our Prayers, our Doxologies, our best Books ; but likewise our Holy Scriptures, our Sacraments, and all the Blessings which flow to us from that Foundation : And, by consequence, we shall give up our whole claim, and Title to everlasting Salvation.

For, no Man can have any access to the Father, but by the Son, nor can any one have Communion with the Son, who is not regenerated, and sanctified by the Holy Spirit ; The Spirit of Adoption, whereby we dwell in *Christ*, and he in us : Let us therefore, hold fast the profession of our Faith without waver-
 • ing, as it has been delivered to us by our Holy Mother the Church of *Christ* ; from whose bosom alone, we can hope to be advanced to the Church triumphant in Heaven ; to the glorious Company of the Apostles, to the goodly Fellowship of the Prophets, to the noble Army of Martyrs ; with whom we shall never cease to render *all Honour, Glory, Praise, and Thanksgiving to the Trinity in Unity world without end.* Amen.

F I N I S.



T H E
R E S U R R E C T I O N
O F
C H R I S T P R O V ' D,
A N D
O b j e c t i o n s A n s w e r e d.

I COR. XV. 20.

Now is Christ risen from the Dead.



THE Credit of this Fact upon which the Truth of the Christian Religion is established, appears by its speedy Propagation soon after the first Plantation of it, by Means and Instruments seemingly very weak and inconsiderable. This was

was such a Proof of the divine Spirit accompanying it, that the *Heathens* attributed its success to the Power of Magick.

For in less than One hundred Years after the Death of *Christ*, it made successful Inroads into the remotest Kingdoms, and captivated the greatest part of Mankind, to the Belief and Practice of it. And although it found the minds of Men prepossessed with a contrary Religion, and consequently had mighty Prejudices to combat with, before it could come to lay Siege with their Reason.

Yet it soon beat down all opposition, and wrought such wonderful Changes in the World, that in a short Time it knew not itself.

They saw the once throng'd Temples of their Deities unfrequented, their adored Gods derided, their celebrated Oracles ceased, The enraged Magistrates disheartned at the unsuccessfulness of their Cruelties. And all this done by poor illiterate Men; who had neither Riches to encourage, or temporal Power to compel by the Sword, or any other than the Armour of God. We find *Mahomet* establishing his Religion by the dint of the Sword, persecuting with War all that would not submit to him, and threatening with no less than Death, all that pretended to dispute the least Article of it; whereas the Christian, quite otherwise was planted in Weakness and Disgrace, in Tears, and Prayers, and Patience, and

and water'd with the Blood of many Thousands of its Professors : We find him allowing of Fornication, justifying Adultery, and talking of War, Rapine and Slaughter, as things enjoyn'd, and commanded by Almighty God, whereas what we have learnt from *Christ* and his Apostles, *1 Thes. iv. 4. 5. is to possess every one his Vessel in Sanctification and Honour, not in the lust of Concupiscence, to live peaceably with all Men.* And instead of invading anothers Property, *Heb. x. 34. to take joyfully the Spoil of our Goods, knowing that we have in Heaven a better and an enduring Substance ;* we find him the better to allure his followers, telling them of pleasant Gardens, curious Fountains, delicate Beds, &c. Whereas in the Resurrection, *we neither Marry nor are given in Marriage, &c.* *

That we have sufficient evidence to Strengthen and confirm our Faith in this great and fundamental Article of our Religion, the Resurrection of *Jesus Christ*.

I shall endeavour to make appear, 1st, by producing the several Proofs, consisting of certain and uncontestable Facts, recorded by the Apostles and Evangelists, and 2dly. such others as are referred to by Christ himself.

The

* *Grotius De vir. Relig. Christ. L. vi. Sect. 7, Hist. of the Bible.*

The Facts are founded 1st, Upon the Testimony of the *Roman* Soldiers, who may be supposed to have had no Prejudice either for or against the Resurrection; who reported that the Sepulchre was miraculously opened by an Angel, for fear of whom they quaked and became as dead Men. * And afterwards of his Body being no more to be found. Of others who were prepossessed with Notions contrary to the Belief of Christ being risen from the Dead, yet affirm'd that they were told by Angels that he was risen from the Dead, who said to them, *Fear not ye for I know that ye seek Jesus which was crucified: he is not here, for he is risen, as he said, come see the Place where the Lord lay; that they themselves had seen, talked with and handled him.* Of the Apostles and Disciples, the chosen Witnesses of his Resurrection; who not only frequently did the same, but familiarly talked, and conversed with him, for forty Days together, in which he Discoursed with them in particular of the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God; and eat and drank with him as really after his Resurrection, as they had done before his Crucifixion, *Act. x. 41.*

2^{dly}. Other evidences are refer'd to by Christ himself, arising 1st from the exact Accomplishment

* *Mat. xxviii. 4. 5. 6.*

accomplishment of the Words he had spoken to them while he was with them, his own Predictions to his Disciples relating to his Sufferings, Death, and Resurrection. * To his Sufferings, by the Treachry of *Judas*, the Denyal of *Peter* three times, § the Flight of Disciples in his Danger, contrary to their own positive and confident Protestations, † that tho' they should die with him, they would never deny him, made when the event was Predicted, on the occasion of the Prediction, || his being deliver'd to the High Priest, by them mocked, insulted, and abused, then deliver'd to the *Roman* Governor; each of which Events he foretold a few hours before they came to pass; thereby proving himself to be the Prophet whom *Moses* foretold the Messiah should be. *Deut.* xviii. 15.

Add to this the Accomplishment of one Prediction more, which he was pleased to speak to the unbelieving *Jews*, who, as we read *John* ii. 18. insolently demanding of him, *what Sign shewest thou unto us, seeing thou doest these things*, *Jesus* answered and said unto them. " *I destroy this Temple, and in three Days I will raise it again.*

His

* *Mat.* xxvi. 25. 53. † 35. § *ibim* 35. Chap.
 || *xvi.* 21. § *Zech.* xiii. 7.

His Prophecies to his Disciples relating to his Sufferings, Death, and rising again from the Dead, recorded by St. *Mathew*, Ch. xvii, 9. xxvi, 32. xvi, 21. repeated by the Angels to the Women at the Sepulchre, *Luke* xxiv, 6, 7. and afterwards confirmed to them by *Christ*.

These Prophecies coming from one, whose other Predictions, had been always accomplished, deserved to be Credited no less then the others, and were not only verified by the Event itself; but confirmed by other Subsequent Events, foretold likewise by him before his Passion, some at the same Time when that was foretold, *John* xvi. 7, 16, 28. And linked with, and depending upon that great Proof of his Divine Power.

Such for Instance were, † his meeting his Disciples in *Galilee*; his being with them a little while before he went to his Father; his Assension into Heaven; his sending to them the promised Comforter with all the glorious Faculties and Powers, they received upon his coming. Another proof referr'd to by Christ himself is the exact accomplishment of the predictions contain'd in the Writings of *Moses* the Prophets, and the Psalmist, setting forth the Design and Purpose of God to redeem Mankind from the Dominion and Power of Sin, by the Righteousness, Sufferings, Death, and Resurrection of the Seed of the Woman, *Isa.* i. 16. *Gen.* iii. 15

G

Without.

† *Mat.* xxvi. 32.

Whithout the Resurrection this great Scheme of divine Mercy had been uncompleat, by that it was perfected, and their Spiritual Redemption from the guilt and power of Sin, tyrannical Usurpation of the Devil, and the Victory over the Grave Death and Hell, purchased for them. The Messiah thereby accomplishing all that the Scriptures foretold of his Glory and Power; the Prophet *Isaiah* cap. 53. is expressly and compleatly fulfilled in Christ, in which many Circumstances of his Life, Sufferings, and Death, are plainly pointed at, for therein we find a very moving and express Description thereof; *that he was to grow up before the Lord as a tender Plant, and as a Root out of a dry ground. That he was to be despised and rejected of Men, a Man of sorrows and acquainted with Grief, that he was wounded for our Transgressions, Bruised for our Iniquities; Oppress'd and Afflicted yet he opened not his Mouth, brought as a Lamb to the Slaughter Cut off out of the Land of the Living, he had done no Violence, neither was deceit in his Mouth.* * and if we compare particular Predictions of the Prophets, with the Historical Passages of his Sufferings, if we joyn the Prophets and Evangelists together, it will most Manifestly appear

* *Pearson on the Creed*, page 88.

appear the Messias was to Suffer nothing which Christ hath not Suffered.

I shall mention here but one remarkable Propheſie of the Reſurrection, *i. e.* that in the 16 *Pſalm*. at the 10th Verſe, quoted from thence by *St. Peter*, that *God would not leave the Soul of Chriſt in Hell, neither would he ſuffer his Holy One to ſee Corruption*, which Words are doubtleſs, an evident and expreſs prediction of his Body riſing from the Grave before it had ſeen and underwent the laſt degree of Corruption.

Another proof of the Sufferings, Death and Reſurrection of Chriſt, is founded on the exact Accompliſhment of the ſeveral Predictions held forth in Types and Figures, ſuch as thoſe two mention'd by our Saviour himſelf;
 * *As Moſes ſays he lifted up the Brazen Serpent in the Wilderneſs, even ſo muſt the Son of Man be lifted up*, and again, *As Jonas was three Days and three Nights in the Whales belly, ſo ſhall the Son of Man be three Days and three Nights in the Heart of the Earth*. The Paſchal Lamb alluded to by *St. Paul* in theſe Words, *Chriſt our Paſſover is ſlain for us*, and the weaved Sheaf alluded to by the ſame Apoſtle *1 Cor. xv. 20. Rom. xi. 16.* and to mention no more

G 2

* *John. iii. 14. Num. xxi. 9. Mat. xii. 48. Jonas i. 17. and ii. 10. 1 Cor. v. 7.*

more that remarkable one of *Isaac*, for we read that *Abraham* offered him up, accounting that God was able to raise him from the dead, from whence also he received him in a Figure. In *Abrahams* intention, *Isaac* died, in his expectation he was to rise from the dead; at the time of his oblation, being spared he was in effect raised from the dead; and was therefore a manifest Type, that the only Son of God was to be sacrificed and die: and that after Death he was truly to be raised again.

When therefore one part of the Promises relating to *Jesus* had been so exactly made good in his Life and Death, it is reasonable to conclude that God did not fail to fulfil the others in his Resurrection.

And as the Event could not have been foreseen, and foretold but by the all Prescient Spirit of God, nor the Resurrection effected without his divine Power, it follows that Christ who foretold them had the Spirit and Power of God, that he was God and by his own Almighty Power rose from the dead. *John. v. 21. x. 17. 18.*

The circumstantial accounts those chosen Witnesses of his Resurrection, have given us of the Means and Opportunities they had of knowing certainly the several Facts attested by them; *i. e.* the infallible proofs mentioned by *St. Luke. Acts. i. 3.* by which he shewed himself alive after his Passion, upon which

which the evidence of that great Event is founded, are sufficient to give force and credit to their evidence, But we have as a farther Attestation thereof their accounts of the accomplishment of other Predictions, connected with, and depending upon that great Even; to wit, for Instance his Ascension into Heaven, the account of which we have *Acts. i.* corresponding with what was spoken by our Saviour himself, to *Mary Magdalane* in the words. *Touch me not for I am not yet ascended to my Father; but go to my Brethren and say unto them, I ascend to my Father and to your Father,* referring to Promises made by him to his Disciples three Nights before, *a little while and ye shall see me, because I go to my Father, John. xvi. 16.* that he would send them the Comforter, to teach them all things and bring all things to their Remembrance, *John xiv. 13.* that he will shew them things to come, *ib. xv. 26.* even the Spirit of Truth, which proceedeth from the Father; that he shall testify of him, that he may abide with you for ever and shall be in you. *John. xiv. 16. 17,* and *v. 12.* that he that believeth on him, the works Miracles that I do, shall he do also, and greater works than these shall he do, because I go to my Father; and chap. *xvi. 20. 22.* that they shall be sorrowful, but their sorrow shall be turned into Joy. and that Joy no man shall take from you. Of this his sending to them the Comforter, to endow them

them with the Power of speaking all Languages, working Miracles, and healing all manner of Deseases, we have an exact History in the *Acts* of the Apostles, chap 1st. and 2d. and God himself gave illustrious Testimonies to their good Credit and Truth, by enabling them to work those Miracles which they 2 *Cor.* xii. 12. *St. Luke.* the Disciple of *St. Paul* with great confidence publicly avouch'd to have been done, adding the Names of the Persons *Acts* iii. 7. xvi. 18. 19. Places and other Circumstances, so that the truth or falsehood of their Narration, might most easily upon enquiry have been discovered by the Magistrates, in those times when they were made, particularly that of the use of Languages which they never had learned, before thousands of People, *Parthians*, and *Medes*, and *Elamites*, and the dwellers in *Mesopotamia* and *Capadocia*. *Pontus* and *Asia*, in *Phrygia* and the Parts of *Lybia*, &c. and of Diseases being healed suddenly by them, in the Presence of the People neither did it deter them that knew the *Jewish* Magistrates were most malicious against them, and the *Romans* none of their Friends, who would omit no occasion to charge them as Guilty of any Crime as the authors of a new Religion, nor did the *Jews* or *Pagans* near their times presume to deny that Miracles were performed by them according to the Promise of our Saviour, the Spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me, and ye also shall

shall bear Witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning.

I shall endeavour now to answer the Objections which have been made against this Article.

† It is argued that the Apostles were Sincere, therefore what they reported was true, to which it is Objected that the sincere Belief of a fact or Doctrine, is no proof of it, the Reasons as follows.

“ Sincerity is a satisfaction to those that have
“ it, but cannot be convincing to those that
“ cannot be sensible of it; nor sure that what
“ is reported of them is their report nor
“ certain that their Judgment and Sincerity
were equal of it be.

Ans. It must then be granted that if we could be Sensible of the Sincerity of the Apostles in their report of this Fact, and sure that what is reported of them is their report, and certain that their Judgment and Sincerity were equal; then the Sincerity of the Apostles in their report of this Fact, must be convincing to us of the truth of it.

1st. I shall endeavour to prove that their Judgment was sound in what they reported concerning this Fact. The Apostles *Mathew John*, and *Peter*, assuredly persuaded their Disciples

Disciples and Hearers that it was true, because they affirm'd themselves to have been Eye Witness of the Fact, by the infallible proofs before mentioned, without which none would have given any Credit to their report in those Times, especially, when to believe them was attended with the greatest Evils and Dangers. These being of the Number of 12 whom Jesus had chosen to be Witnesses of his Life, Doctrine, and Resurrection, it was necessary for them to that end to have had perfect Knowledge of the Things which they wrote.

Nor could St. *Paul* be deceived by Ignorance, when he openly declared, 1 *Cor.* xv. 9. 1 *Cor.* xii. 4. that he saw Christ reigning in Heaven, nor concerning the Doctrines which he professes were revealed to him by Jesus himself from thence; and he appealed to 500 Witnesses 1 *Cor.* who saw him alive after his Death, the greatest part of whom were alive and the surviving Children and Friends of those who were dead, might then have been called to testify what they had heard. The same may be affirmed by St. *Luke* his Disciple and inseparable Companion in his Journeys, who could easily know what he wrote concerning the Life, Death, and Resurrection of Christ, having been Born very near, and Traveled over *Palestine*, where he says he spoke with those who were Eye Witnesses

nesses of the Things which he wrote, besides the Apostles with whom he was intimate also, divers many then lived, healed by Jesus, and who saw him dead and raised to Life.

Therefore their Judgment could not be deceived, because they had perfect Knowledge of the Things which they wrote, also they were Sincere, because they could have no will or Inclination to lie; for in so doing, they could expect neither Honour or Riches, the former being all in the Power of the *Heathens* or *Jews*, of whom they were reproached and slandered; and the Profession of Christ raised from the dead; was often punished with the Spoiling of the Professors Goods.

Fame only among their own Believers was not somuch worth that for the sake thereof such simple plain Men, whose Lives and Doctrine were clear against Pride, who were not reproached even by their Enemies for any Crime, who objected nothing against them but their Simpleness which is not fitten to invent falsehoods, should undergo so great Evils, to propogate a falsity, neither could they look for so great a Progress of their Doctrine, which both Nature, intent upon its own Advantages, and the Authority of those in Power every where opposed, but from a divine Promise. let it be added that they could by no means promise that Fame, whatsoever it was would be dureable to them; since God on purpose concealing his design therein, they expected

H

the

the Destruction * of the whole World, threatening as if it were hard by ; nor could any other profits of the World move them to lie ; since the Preaching of the Gospel exposed them to Evils and Dangers, and obliged them to quit all Care of Temporal Goods, there were none of them who did not Suffer all the most grievous Hardships ; † as strips and imprisonments and also many of them the most exquisite Deaths for that Testimony of Jesus's being raised again. That any one should endure such for an Opinion conceived in his Mind, it might be thro' Prejudice, but that for a lie which he knows to be so, any would endure all these and not one but many such plain Men ; whose Interest it was not, that it should be believed, but the direct contrary thereto, and the same may be said of St. *Paul* who wanted no hope of Honour or Profit if he would have denied his Profession, and their maintaining it if false, they knew must have exposed them to the Wrath of God, who forbids lies, and false Testimonies in holy Things chiefly is wholly incredible if not impossible, unless they had been mad, which their Life and Writtings shew them not to have been.

2d. What is reported of them is their report ; * § because the Fathers *Justin Irenaeus*
Clement

* *Thes.* iv. 14. 15. 16. 1 *Cor.* xv. 52, † *Act.* v. 40. 41.

* See *Grotius De. vir. Relig. Ce. L.* 3. 13. § Item p. 62. 63. † *Observation on the History and Evidence of the Resurrection*, by Gilbert West, Esq; page. 362. 368.

Clemens, and others cite their Books under their Names, whom we call the Authors of them, and *Tertullian* declares there were some Manuscripts extant in his Time, written by the Apostles, that they were received by the Churches then as their Writings, nor did *Pagans*, *Jews*, or the *Apostate Juliam*, deny them so to be.

And though it hath been said by *M. Woolston*, that “ ’tis happy for us that the very Account given by the pretended Witnesses of this Fact is sufficient to disprove the credit of it. It † hath been lately proved that out of the great Number of Facts related by the sacred writers, not one in the Course now of above Seventeen hundred Years hath ever been disproved, tho’ many of them have been denied and still are ; and that on the contrary they are clear of contradicting each other in the smallest Article.

5thly. Every thing did not happen that was proper to convince the World of the Resurrection because the World and in particular the *Jews* were not convinced of it, nor are yet the Publick appearance of *Jesus* among the *Jews*, afterwards was necessary that he should put the Truth of his Mission upon the Truths of his rising, yet never discover that truth to them by rising before them, a special and particular Action requires a special and particular Proof, to every Country and Age, which are specially and particularly concerned in it. I
reply

reply, " we find that Jesus, had two distinct
 " Offices, one as the Messias promised to the
 " *Jews*, the other as he was to be the Great High
 " Priest of the World. " That the first with
 respect to which he is called the Apostle of
 the *Hebrews*, the Minister of the Circum-
 cision, and says himself *I am not sent but unto*
the lost Sheep of the House of Israel, upon their
 finally rejecting him and his Doctrine, and put-
 ting him to Death, was expired, and God have-
 ing departed from them, their Fate was fixed
 concerning all the Judgments foretold by our
 Saviour to befall them, for their so rejecting
 and murdering him; and the Kingdom of
 God to be taken from them and given to
 the *Gentiles*, who should make a better use
 'ont then they had done, he could not after
 his Resurrection appear to them consistently
 with his own Prediction. *Ye shall see me no*
more till ye say, blessed is he that cometh in the
Name of the Lord; upon his Resurrection
 then was founded this his new and last Com-
 mission, of his being the great High Priest
 of the World; and therefore the *Jews* had
 no reason to expect, much less to demand a
 special and peculiar Evidence above any other
 Nation. For why might not the City of
Rome the Imperial City of the World, expect
 this Evidence as much; nay, much more than
 the City of *Jerusalem*; for this was but a
 City Tributary to the other, nay upon the
 Commencement of Christs general Commission
 why might not every City or Nation make
 the

the same demand with the City and Nation of *Israel*? If then the Evidence of his Resurrection given to the *Jews* was sufficient to satisfy them as we have proved why should not the *Jews* and not only they, but all other People under Heaven rest contented with the same Evidence?

What did Jesus say to convince the Disciples, that the Messia of the Prophets was not to be a Temporal King?

The Disciples from his many wonderful works, as well as the unspotted Holiness of his Life, believed him to be Christ the Messia, which

¶ It should be considered, that our Lord, being now after his Resurrection to act according to the Majesty of the Divine Nature, and not according to the Infirmities, and Condesension so the Human; it did not so well comport with the Dignity he had assum'd, to converse publicly, or Submit himself to to the Censures, and fresh affronts of his Enemies. But allowing it had been consistent, yet the unbelieving *Jews* [especially the Chief Priests and Rulers] were of all Men most unworthy to have so extraordinary a way of conviction afford them them. *Jenkins's reasonableness of the Christian Religion. Vol. 2d.*

Supposing, for the present that our Saviour had appeared Publickly to the *Jewish* Rulers, yet since neither the Darkness at his Death, nor the Earthquake at his Resurrection, neither the declaration of the Centurion on the one, or the confession of the Soldiers on the other Occasion; had wrought in them any Remorse; we can hardly suppose, but that had he so appeared, they would have offer'd to lay violent Hands upon him, as they before did against *Lazarus*, and for the same Reason: in which case had our Saviour vanished out of their Hands as doubtless he would, what would they have concluded from thence; but they had seen a Ghost, a Spectre or Apparition? And what Conviction would that have wrought, but that their Senses had been imposed upon by some magical Illusion? And what Effect would this have had upon their minds towards bringing them to a Belief that Christ was truly risen from the Dead, none at all. *South's Sermons Vol. 5. History of the Bible, page. 9. 1492.*

which Title he claimed and shews that he is so, *John* v. 19. 20. 21. &c. by proving his Equality and Unity with the Father, in their Essence, Will, Wisdom, Power, and Works ; and also that the *Father* would shew him *greater Works*, as so many proofs of his Godhead then had yet been seen ; as 21st. *his Quickening the Dead*, 22d. *being the Object of divine Honour*, 23d. *giving Eternal Life*, 24th. *Quickening dead Souls*, i. e. *bestowing Spiritual Life*, 25th. *having a Fountain of Life*, 26th. *Raising the Dead at the last Day* 28. 29. And moreover refers to many other proofs of his being so, from the Testimony of *John* the Baptist, 33d. and that Voice from Heaven, *Mat*, iii. 17, the Work of Redemption, and lastly, 39th, exhorts the *Jews* diligently to examine *the Scriptures of the Old Testament*, which themselves acknowledged to set forth the true way to Eternal Life, as did his Disciples their Brethren, who having been educated in their Religion, were strongly possess'd with the selfish Carnal, and National Prejudices of that Religion, as Taught by the *Scribes* and *Pharisees*. These by not rightly understanding the true Meaning of some Prophecies, expected for their Messiah, a temporal King, a Redeemer and Ruler of *Israel* only, to subdue all other Nations under them, still as a distinct People ; for the removal of this Prejudice, he recommends them to the Searching the Scriptures, telling them that upon due Tryal they would find

find that all the Prophecies and Types were fulfilled in him; and all the Promises of Life there made, had respect to him and pointed him out the true Messia, *Deut.* xviii. 15. and v. 45. 46. tells the *Jews* that he was not their only accuser to the Father, *there is one that accuseth you, even Moses*, for he wrote of me *Gen.* iii. 15. *Deut.* xviii. 15. although he constantly disclaimed the Character of a temporal Prince. likewise *Mat.* xvi. 21. the Apostles being confirmed in the Belief of his Person, as the true Messiah 16th. he plainly foretells his sufferings, to forewarn them, that they might not take Offence thereat. 2dly, that they might prepare themselves for their own Tryal, which would then befall them, 3dly. and to rectify their erroneous Apprehensions about his temporal Kingdom, and after his Resurrection, *Luke* xxiv. 26. refers them to the Writings of the Prophets *Is.* l. 16. *Gen.* iii. 15. and xxii. 18. and xxvi. 4 *Pf.* xxii. cxxxii. 11. *Dan.* ix. 24 *Deut.* xviii. 15. who foretold his Sufferings, and the Glory that should follow.

“ The Apostles said, *Luke* xxi. 31, *Mat.* xxiv. 5. 9. 1 *Cor.* xi. 26, 27. 28. 29. *Act* iii. 20. 1 *Thes.* i. 10. iv. 15. 16. 17. v. 1. “ 2 3. that before that Generation was dead, “ Jesus would come again, raise them that “ believed in him, reign over the *Jews*, and “ subdue the *Gentiles*, ”

By

By the Kingdom of God, *Luke* xxi. 31. Prophesied by our Saviour to be nigh at Hand, and *Mat.* xxiv. 5. 6. and x. 12. even at the Door when the Things here mentioned should come to pass, is understood that dreadful exercise of his Regal Power in the destruction of the City and Temple of *Jerusalem*; the Signs and Wonders preceeding that destruction; the Miseries coming upon the *Jews* before, at, and after the Siege of that City, the dispersion of that reprobated People, and the duration of their Calamity, for their obstinate rejecting him from being their *Messiah*; and deliverance of those who Faithfully Adher'd to him; all which Calamities were foretold by him in some of the afore cited Passages, to befall the *Jews* before that Company of Men were all dead.

And *St. Paul* says *Rom.* xi. 5. vii. 25. 26. the Remnant according to the Election of Grace the small Number of the *Jews* who embrace the Gospel, such as God of his free Grace hath chosen to Life, tho' the generality rejected it 7th. the Election hath obtained *Righteousness and Life, by Faith in Christ*, Tho' *Israel*, the Body of the *Jewish* Nation, hath not; the rest were blinded: The rest who are left by Gods Judgment to their own ignorance and obstinacy, to shut their Eyes against the clear Light of the Gospel, and also to *Satan* to increase it in them; or 25th. *Blindness in part, i. e.* for a certain time hath happened

to

to *Israel*, during which time *Jerusalem* shall be troden down of the *Gentiles*, *i. e.* Subject to them and the *Jews* remain in their State of Dispersion, Ignorance, and Alienation from Christ, till the full Time of the *Gentiles* be come in, *i. e.* till the full time be accomplished, which God has appointed for the total Ruin of the *Roman* Empire, the fourth Monarchy *i. e.* untill all *Antichristian* Powers shall be utterly destroyed, which shall come to pass under the Sixth Vial. *Rev.* xix, 20. and the *Turks* overthrown, *Rev.* xvi. 12. and then all *Israel* shall be saved, *i. e.* the body of the *Jewish* Nation shall be converted to the Christian Faith, brought into the way of Salvation, and become a common Wealth again, 26th. as it is written, *Is.* lix. 20. the deliverer, *i. e.* the Messiah shall convert the whole Nation of the *Jews* from their Unbelief, and turn them to the Faith in Christ, [which promise tho' it was in part fulfilled at Christ's coming, yet shall be more fully and compleatly accomplished towards the end of the World,] or as others interpret the Words, *Luke* xxi. 24. with its paralell, *Rom.* xi. 25. 26. until by the Conversion of the *Jews* to the Christian Faith, the fullness of the *Gentiles* to be converted to it, should come in with them; and all own Christ their Spiritual King, * accordingly he teaches

I

* *Jer.* iii. 14. 17. *Luke* i. 32. 33.

teaches his Disciples that his was to be a Spiritual Kingdom, * *Mat* xx. from Verse 21st. to Verse the 28th. and its parallel *Mark* x. 35. 45. there we read that *James* and *John* the Sons of *Zebedee*, requested of our Saviour that they might sit, *the one on his Right hand and the other on his Left, in his Kingdom or Glory*: meaning that they might be next to him in Dignity and Authority, when he should enjoy that glorious Kingdom they expected on Earth; still dreaming of a temporal Kingdom of Christ or such a Kingdom as he should administer, with all the Splendor, Power, and Glory of the World, 22d. but Jesus answered and said, *ye know not what ye Ask, are ye able to drink of the Cup that I shall drink of, and to be Baptized with the Baptizm that I am Baptized with*, as if he had said, you are much Mistaken about the Nature of my Kingdom which is wholly Spiritual; and therefore will not gratify your carnal Expectations, but rather on the contrary is attended with manifold Troubles.

If you'd partake of the Privileges of my Kingdom, you must prepare yourselves to share with me in Sufferings, which are the Way to it. 24th. *the others bearing this were Mov'd with Indignation, against the two Brethren,*

* *Dan.* vii. 14. *Mick.* iv. 7

Brethren, and had a strife among themselves which of them should have this Precedency, but Jesus answered and said, 25th. ye know that the Princes of the Gentiles exercise Dominion, and Authority upon them.

Here he shews that though in secular Kingdoms the Grandees are endowed with Dignity and Authority, yet it should not be so in his Kingdom, no such civil compulsory external Power and Authority shall be exercised by you over one another, or over the Church, but he that is greatest and chiefest among you in Gifts, Authority, Age, or any other Qualification, let him be as the younger free, from all Pride, Ambition, Usurpation and Contempt of others; and carry himself with that Humility, Modesty and Moderation which become the meanest, *i. e.* him that doth serve, looking upon himself as the Servant of others, and not their Master, 21st. *as the Son of man came not to be Ministred unto i. e.* to take upon him an earthly Dominion, and stately Preheminence, like a temporal Monarch; but to Minister, *i. e.* to perform all fitting Service both for the Souls and Bodies of others, for 27th. *whether is greater he that sitteth at meat &c. i. e.* for the Administration of the affairs in my Kingdom, is not like the Management of Things in the Kingdoms of the World; for there the King sits at Meat, and his Subjects serve him, but here I the King do serve, I condescend to wash

your Feet, provide necessaries for you ; and therefore much more should you stoop to others for their good ; to obtain Honour, Esteem and Respect in my Kingdom by being serviceable to the Souls of others. by which contrariety of Christs Kingly Office, to that of the Kings of the Earth, it appears, that the Power and Authority he assum'd, and left to his Apostles and Ministers, and to the Pastors and Teachers of his Church, was only Spiritual, over the Souls and Consciences of Men ; 2 Cor. x. 4. 5. *For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds. 5th. Casting down Imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the Knowledge of God, and bringing into Captivity every thought to the Obedience of Christ.* for we find *John vi. 15.* that when they would take him by force to make him a King, whether they had Power so to do, or not, he wrought a Miracle to escape from them, therefore when he uttered those Expressions, *John xviii. 36.* at his Arraignment it could not be with an Intent to avert the Fury of his Judges, as it was the same which he had always signified before by his Words and Actions, why then was the Government alarm'd, and Jesus looked upon as a Person dangerous to the State ?

The Reason of this is founded upon their mistaken Notions of the Messiah, in whom they expected a glorious Temporal Prince, a deliverer

deliverer of *Israel* only from their carnal En-
 meties and Oppressors; the People several
 times took him for the Messiah and re-
 ceived him with such divine Honour, as could
 only be due to Sovereign Authority, *Mat.*
xxi. 4. 5. 9. *All this was done, that it*
might be fulfilled which was spoken by the
Prophets saying, tell ye the Daughter of Sion
Behold thy King cometh unto thee Meek, and
sitting upon a Colt the foal of an Ass. 9th.
And the Multitude that went before, and that
follow'd after, cried saying, Hosanna to the
Son of David; Blessed is he that cometh
in the Name of the Lord Hosanna in the
highest. Luke xix. Once when he was com-
 ing to *Jerusalem*, they thought that the
 Kingdom of God would immediately appear,
i. e. that as soon as he came to *Jerusalem*
 he'd take upon him Regal Authority, and
 render himself Glorious by some external
 Pomp and Splendour; and when the whole
 Multitude of the Disciples hail'd him as the
 Messiah, 39. some of the *Pharisees* said unto
 him, Master rebuke thy Disciples, meaning
 least this might be ill interpreted by the *Ro-*
mans and some Mischief might come of it; and
 another Time *John xi. 48. to 50.* they express
 their Fears of the ill Consequence of his Pop-
 ularity, from the Jealousie of the *Romans*,
 who might suspect that they would grow Se-
 ditious and make him a King, and so might
 come and destroy their Temple, City, and
 People

People; and urge this Danger they apprehend as a just Reason for putting him to Death; how innocent soever, thereby to secure the Nation.

Accordingly *Luke* xxiii. 2, the Chief Priests the Rulers, and the People, arraign him before *Pilate*, as one that perverted the Nation and People, *i. e.* draws them from the Religion their fore Fathers, established by Law or from their Subjection and Obedience to the *Roman* Powers.

Ob. Inspiration is the only foundation any false Religion, can lay claim to, and be supported by, the true Religion has no need of it, it is founded on the Eternal Attributes of the Deity.

Ans. The true Religion by which is meant Natural Religion, considered as such a Collection of moral Principles and Precepts as are founded on the Natures, Reasons, and Relations of Things, and their absolute fitnesses, howsoever comprehensive and compleat it may be in this Sense, as the Rule or directive Part; yet as to the coercive part to us, *i. e.* the Belief of the Existence of a God, and the Sense and Practice of those Duties which result from the Knowledge we by our Reason have of him, and his Perfections; and of our selves, and our Imperfections; and the Relation in which we stand to him and our fellow Creatures: If the Knowledge we by our Reason have of him, and his Perfections; and
of

of ourselves and our Imperfections, and the Relation in which we stand to him and our Fellow Creatures ; is but weak and imperfect, as it certainly is ; the Belief of the Existence of a God and the Sense and Practice of Duties resulting from that Knowledge, and from the Knowledge of those moral Principles and Precepts founded in the Natures, Reasons and Relations of Things, and their absolute fitnesses ; and of all those Beings with which we are surrounded, must of Consequence be so, likewise, and therefore we need an inspir'd Revelation to make them more clear, and certain to all Capacities ; and this it has done, and has likewise discovered the acceptableness of Repentance towards God.

“ § I can find no account where or when such
 “ publick Prophecie was delivered before the
 “ the Priests and *Pharisees*, i. e. of the Resur-
 “ rection as that mentioned by *Mat. xxvii.*
 “ 63. *Sir we remember that, that deceiver*
 “ *said, while he was yet alive, after three*
 “ *Days I will rise again.*

Ans. Besides two predictions mentioned
Mat. xii. 40. and the other *John ii. 19.* we
 find another very clear express Prediction men-
 tioned to have been given, to his Disciples
 after

after they had been confirmed in the Belief of his Person as the Messiah, *Mat. xvi. 21. From that time forth began Jesus to shew unto his Disciples, how that he must go to Jerusalem, and suffer many Things, of the Elders, Chief Priests, and Scribes; and be killed, and be raised again the third Day.* By the Words of which it seems, as if this had been divers Times repeated to them, so that it could hardly escape the Knowledge of their Brethren the Jews the Evangelist telling us they remembred it; but as to that mentioned *John ii. 19. destroy this Temple, and in three Days I will raise it up.*

“ The Rulers could not certainly know by
 “ this, the words being Ambiguous, that
 “ Jesus was to die, and rise again; and be so
 “ much alarmed about it. The words of *St.*
 “ *John.* when uttered, seemed not to be so
 “ intended nor understood, to be a Prediction
 “ of the Resurrection, where the Jews said
 “ to Jesus, *John ii. 18. 19. What Sign shewest*
 “ *thou unto us, seeing thou dost these things.*
 “ 19th. Jesus answered and said unto them,
 “ *Destroy this Temple and in three Days*
 “ *I will raise it up.*

Ans. Notwithstanding there be some seeming obscurity in this Prediction, which prevented even the Disciples from thoroughly understanding their Masters meaning, until after he was risen from the Dead; yet the same is express'd in the plainest and most intelligible Words

Words, by the other Evangilests ; which tho' thro' their Prejudices they were unwilling nay absolutely refused to believe, *Mat.* xvi. 22. yet that unwillingness was a plain discovery, that they were apprehensive the Words were capable of admitting a literal Sense, tho' they did not believe the Prediction would be accomplished, and this was sufficient to provoke the Pride and Malice of the Chief Priests and Rulers, to endeavour to convince all the World that Jesus was an Imposter, by defeating this Prediction. " Tho' *Jonah* was " not indeed dead the three Days and three " Nights mentioned *Mat.* xii. 40. he was in " the Belly of the Fish, yet in the expectation " of Men he was dead, and being cast alive " upon the shore, he was in effect received " from the dead, which makes the Parallel " exact."

Object. " As to Time this tells us, the Son " of Man was to lie three Days and three " Nights in the Heart of the Earth ; as *Jonah* " did three Days and three Nights in the " Whales Belly. Whereas, at the most Jesus " laid but half the time of three Days and " three Nights."

Ans. Notwithstanding between the Time of our Lords Crucifixion and Resurrection there could intervene but one Day, two Nights, yet by Days here are meant natural Days, and including that upon which he was buried, he rose the

third Day, and therefore after he had lain part of three natural Days. *

" When Jesus was in *Galilee*, he foretold " his Resurrection to his Disciples, according " to *Mat.* xvii. 22. 23. while they abode in " *Galilee*, Jesus said unto them, *The Son of* " *Man shall be betrayed into the hands of Men,* " *and they shall kill him, and the third Day* " *he shall rise again:* And they were exceed- " ing sorry, according to *Mark* ix. 30. 31. " 32. *And he passed thro' Galilee and would* " *not that any Man should know it;* for he " taught his Disciples, and said unto them, " *the Son of Man is delivered into the hands* " *of Men, and they shall kill him, and after* " *that he is killed, he shall rise the third* " *Day, but they understood not that saying.* " 'Tis strange that they should be sorry for " what they did not understand; or that they " should not understand what they were " sorry for."

Ans. When it is said of the Disciples *Mark* ix. 9, 10. that they understood not that say- ing, and questioned one with another what the rising from the Dead should mean; it could never be intended by the Evangelist, that they could not understand the literal meaning of expressions so plain, but that they

they were willing to take the Words in some mystical Sense.

From this Sorrow it appears they could not be ignorant of the literal Sense of those Words, and from the Behaviour of *Peter* on the like Occasion, who rebuked him saying *Mat. xvi. 22 Be it far from thee Lord, this shall not be unto thee.* When it is said *but they understood not that saying*, the meaning is, they could not apprehend the Mystery of his Death; how he being the Messiah, the Son of God, that had wrought so many Miracles and concerning whose Kingdom, there were so many glorious Promises, (with the expectation where of their understandings, were so captivated that they could not give credit to any thing that was inconsistent therewith) could or should come really to suffer Death; or for what end or purpose, much less how he should rise again after he was dead; but thought some other Construction was to be put upon such Passages. For had they understood or taken the Words in the latter Construction, they could not consistently with their Notions of the Messiah, whom they thought according to their Law and the Prophets, was to abide for ever, have believed him, as they did to be the Messiah. as to *Johns* omitting Christs foretelling his Resurrection, it is well known that he wrote

wrote his Gospel the last of the Evangelists, and that he was not curious to insert therein every Thing which had been carefully related before; by the other Evangelists; but chose rather to mention those things which had not been spoken of by the others, according to *Epiphanius*, and therefore says plainly what none of the others doe. * *For as yet they knew not the Scriptures, that he must rise again from the Dead. i. e.* they did not know or rightly consider the Prophecies relating to this Transaction. § “It must appear an irreconcilable absurdity, that Jesus should expressly foretell his Resurrection to his Disciples, and say nothing of it plainly to the *Scribes* and *Pharisees*, yet that these should be so alarmed with the Words of a Man they did not believe, as to Watch it, and the Disciples not understand, nor expect it. “But that the *Priests* and *Pharisees*, set no Watch, and that even the Disciples were not forewarn’d of their Masters rising again, will more fully appear; 1st. because the *Priests* and *Pharisees* going next Day to set the Watch, and seeing how the Body was Spiced, Pickled, and preserved for keeping; would they not have taken the Soldiers back with them.”

‘ The Women also which came with him
 ‘ from *Galilee*, and beheld the Sepulchre, and
 ‘ how the Body was laid, knew that * *Nico-*
 ‘ *demus* had laid it in Spices: * This shews
 ‘ that there was no Watch; for they appear
 ‘ under no Apprehensions of any Molestation.
 ‘ λ They consulted together as they went,
 ‘ who shall roll us away the Stone from the
 ‘ Door of the Sepulchre? which they would
 ‘ not have said, if they had known it was
 ‘ sealed: μ Therefore if they, *i. e.* *Mary Mag-*
 ‘ *dalen* and the other *Mary*, went to anoint
 ‘ the Body, there was no Expectation of a
 ‘ Resurrection, consequently no Prediction of
 ‘ one, nor Seal set to prevent a fraudulent
 ‘ one, when none at all was expected. ψ The
 ‘ chief Priests and Pharisees had no Reason to
 ‘ be under such Consternation, therefore there
 ‘ is no Ground to believe they were; it was
 ‘ so little to their Purpose to guard against ei-
 G ther

* There is Reason to believe, that the *Jews*, when
 they came to be informed of this, deposed him from the
 Dignity of a Senator, excommunicated him, and drove
 him out of *Jerusalem*. Nay it is farther said, that they
 would have put him to Death; but that in Consideration
 of *Gamaliel*, who was his Uncle, or Cousin-German, they
 contented themselves with beating him almost to Death,
 and plundering his Goods. *Calmet's Dictionary*, under
 the Name.

* Page 25.

λ Page 2.

μ Page 25.

ψ Page 27.

‘ther real or fraudulent Resurrection, that
 ‘they could not possibly be guilty of so weak
 ‘a Conduct. π What if they did say unto
 ‘the People, he is risen from the Dead, if
 ‘they had no Proof of that Assertion.’

Ans. Predictions delivered by our Saviour to his Disciples must have been repeated by them, or those who went in and out with them, to their Brethren the *Jews*, of which therefore they must have known as well as the others; for St. *Matthew*, Chap. xxvii. 63. says, they remembered them. But though from these Predictions none of them had any Expectations of a real Resurrection, being all under the same Prejudices, through their Misconstruction of the Words of the Prophets, according to which they expected a Messiah to conquer and subdue their carnal Enemies, under whom they should reign for ever over all other Nations of the Earth; yet from the different Dispositions of both at that Time; of the Disciples, who would be glad to see their Master bodily risen from the Dead, and of the Scribes and Pharisees, whose Malice against him was not extinguished with his Death: Their doing as they did was not at all unlike them, that the Prophecies might be defeated, and all the World convinced of the
 Imposture,

Imposture, as they called it. But if these apprehended a fraudulent Resurrection, as they told *Pilate*, then they must have had no more Expectations of a real one than his Disciples : In this Case, the setting a Watch must certainly have been greatly to their Purpose, to prevent a fraudulent one ; for then they must think, that only by his Body being detained in the Sepulchre, till after the Time prefixed by our Saviour for his rising again, or by a fraudulent Resurrection, they could have proved him an Impostor ; and they had this, and this only to guard against, in order to have proved him so, if a real one was not proved, in order to have proved the contrary, and that the Body was still in the Sepulchre, after the Time prefixed.

And though the Disciples saying to the People, he was risen from the Dead, would not have been sufficient to have convinced them of the Truth of that Assertion without farther Proof, yet a Watch set to prevent any such Attempt of his Disciples, as stealing away his Body, would certainly have been very effectual against their presuming to publish any such Report, as that he was risen, if by that Means they could have proved the contrary, or at least to have prevented any from believing them ; which was the Danger, they say, they apprehended, if they had published it. But if it can be proved a Guard was

really set, these Cavils are thereby answered at once.

This we prove from the Testimony of the Evangelist, who gives an incontestible Proof of his Veracity, by naming ‘ the Time, the Scene of Action, the Actors, and Witnesses of this Fact: The Time was that of the Celebration of the Passover, the most solemn Festival of the *Jews*; the Scene was in *Jerusalem*, the Metropolis of *Judæa*, and at that Time crowded with *Jews* *, who came from all Parts of the Earth to keep the Passover.’

The Actors and Witnesses were the chief Priests and Elders, *Pontius Pilate* the Roman Governor, and the *Roman* Soldiers who guarded the Sepulchre, &c.

‘ They tell *Pilate*, that *Jesus* said, after three Days he would rise again; yet they desire the Sepulchre may be made sure but till the third Day. They should have desired leave to watch it till the fourth Day, or till the third was past unless till the third Day, within, and after three Days, signify the same Thing.’

Three Days and three Nights, till the third Day, and within three Days, according to their

* See Observations on the History and Evidence of the Resurr. of *Jesus Christ*, by *Gilbert West*, Esq; p. 345, &c.
o. Page 28.

their Computation, signify the same Thing. He suffered on the sixth Day, being our *Friday*, between the ninth and twelfth Hours, and rose on *Sunday* Morning, being after three Days, or the third Day. On the Evening of the next Day after the Burial of Christ, the chief Priests and Pharisees went and made the Sepulchre sure, sealing the Stone, and setting a Watch: But they were under no Kind of Necessity of doing it before the Evening, or shutting in of the second Day, though it was highly expedient for them not to delay it beyond that Time, because they gave out, that what they did was to prevent the ill Consequence they apprehended from the Prediction of Christ, mentioned *Matt. xxvii. 63.* That Deceiver said, while he was yet alive, *After three Days I will rise again.* The ill Consequence they apprehended was, lest his Disciples come by Night and steal him away, and say to the People, he is risen from the Dead: If so, it was necessary for them to guard against any such Attempt on that Day, and for that Day only, which they understood to be the Day limited by Christ in the Prophecy, for his rising from the Dead. It is manifest therefore, that they took the Day on which they set the Watch, to be second, and the Day following, which was then beginning, to be third, because they intended it, as they said, to prevent an Evil, which might otherwise happen on that Day.

For

For it would have been senseless and impertinent of them to have desired a Watch to prevent an Evil they expected not till after the Night and Day following.

‘ There is great Probability of Forgery in the Relation of this Fact ; for it was not only in the Power of the Historians, who ever they were, to write what they pleased of Jesus, so long after his Death as the Gospels were written ; but it has been, in all Probability, in the Power of Possessors to corrupt what was before written.’

It is incumbent upon those, who charge Forgery upon the Authors of this Relation, to prove it, or to alledge some Reason, which might probably induce those Authors to be guilty of any such Forgery or Change of Writings, which in this Case cannot be said *.

And

* There is nothing in the Books of the New Testament unsuitable to the Age in which they are supposed to have been written : There appears in these Writers a Knowledge of the Affairs of those Times not to be found in Authors of later Ages ; we are hereby assured, that the Books of the New Testament are genuine, and that they were written by Persons who lived at or near the Time of those Events, of which they have given the History. Any one may be sensible, how hard it is for the most learned, acute, and cautious Man to write a Book in the Character of some Person of an earlier Age, and not betray his own Time by some Mistake about the Affairs of the Age in which he pretends to place himself, or by Allusions to Customs and Principles since sprung up, or by

some

And it has been shewn, in Answer to the first Objection, that they must have had perfect Knowledge of the Things which they wrote, and could have no Will to be guilty of any Falschhood or Forgery; to believe which, so heinous a Crime concerning them, in a Matter so contrary to their Interest, in any other Sense, than as it was for the Honour of God, their Lives and Doctrine, every where full of Piety, forbid us.

And as to the Objection, that it was in the Power of the Possessors to corrupt what was before written, I shall endeavour to shew, that it neither was in their Power, nor was there ever any Corruption of those Writings. It has before been proved, that the Books were written by those Authors, whose Names they bear; which being laid down, it follows, that contrary Books are not put in their Place; also that any remarkable Part is not changed: For whereas that Change ought to have something proposed to itself, that Part would notably differ from other Parts and Books not so changed, which is no where seen, rather an admirable Harmony of Senses is every where. Then, as soon as ever any of the Apostles, or Apostolical Men published any thing, there is no Doubt but that Christians, with great Diligence,

some Phrases and Expressions not then in Use, &c. *Lardner's Credibility of the Gospel History*, p. 381, &c. *Grotius*, de Ver. Chr. Relig. lib. iii. §. 4.

gence, took to themselves from thence many Patterns, as it became their Piety and Care of preserving and propagating the Truth to Posterity; which thereupon might be scattered abroad, as widely as the Christian Name was spread, through *Europe*, *Asia*, and *Egypt*, in which Places the *Greek* Speech flourished; and some few original Copies have been preserved even to the second Century.

Any Book scattered abroad into so many Patterns, preserved not only by the private, but the common Diligence of Churches, could not receive a forging Hand. Moreover, in the next Ages, those Books were translated into the *Syriac*, *Ethiopic*, *Arabic*, and *Latin* Speeches, which Versions are till now extant, and differ from the *Greek* Books in nothing of any Moment. And now we have the Writings of those, who have been instructed by the Apostles themselves, or by their Disciples, who alledge not a few Places out of these Books, in that Sense which we now also read: Neither was there any in the Church of so great Authority in those Times, to whom, willing to change any Thing, Obedience was paid, which the free Differences of *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, and *Cyprian*, from those who especially excelled in the Church, abundantly shew.

After these Times which I have named, divers, many followed, of great Learning and Judgment,

Judgment, who, after diligent Search, received these Books as continuing in their original Purity: And that, after so many Sects sprung up in Christianity, scarce one was found, who did not hold either all, or the greater Part of them, is a great Argument that nothing could be opposed against them, since those Sects burned with so great Hatred among themselves, that whatever pleased one, for the same Reason would displease another *.

τ Miracles, when attested by their own Party, Persons to be sure whose Veracity they could depend upon, as in this Case, must have prevented them from doing what it is here pretended they did.

The Accounts of the many Miracles done by Christ, recorded in the Gospels, shew how little Effect they had toward working their Conversion; and in particular their imputing his casting out Devils to a diabolical Power. When our Saviour confutes them, φ Wherefore I say unto you, all Manner of Sin and Blasphemy shall be forgiven unto Men; but the Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall

H

not

* See *Grotius*, de Veritate Christ. Relig. lib. iii. §. 9.

τ Page 31.

φ Matt. xii. 24, 25, 26, 27, 32.

not be forgiven, neither in this World, nor in the World to come: Which is as much as prophesying of this their Infidelity, in resisting and denying the Power of the Holy Ghost, miraculously shewn in raising him from the Dead, as the Apostle testifies, who says, he was quickened by the Spirit. And this is as much as if he had said, though the Miracles I now shew do sufficiently testify of me, that I come from God; yet, when ye shall see greater Things than these, as ye will do in the extraordinary Effects of that divine Power, whereby I shall be raised from the Dead, your Sin will be aggravated by your refusing the highest and most incontestable Evidence that can be afforded; and consequently the Guilt of your Infidelity will be for ever irremissible, both here and hereafter *.

* But, as an eminent Writer observes, the Disciples had an Interest in it; for all their Hopes depended upon the Divinity of their Master, which was now demonstrated by his rising again from the Dead; whereas the *Jews* Interest (as their Malice had brought it about) lay quite on the other Side: The Report of his Resurrection threatened them with the Danger of being called to account for their malicious Prosecution of him; and therefore they feared and hated the Report, and therefore would not believe it, how credible soever the Witnesses had made it appear. *Young's Sermons*, p. 336.

Object.

Object. ' If they, *i. e.* the Rulers, bribed
' the Soldiers to spread a false Report, and
' they spread it, no Doubt they bribed them
' to keep counsel, and they kept it *a.*'

Ans^r. ‘ Although the Soldiers, who had taken their Money, might be faithful to them, keep their Secret, and attest the Story they had framed for them, yet the Truth might come out by means of those whom they had not bribed ; for *St. Matthew* says, that some of the Watch came into the City, and shewed unto the chief Priest all the Things that were done ; some therefore remained behind, who probably had no Share of the Money, or if they had, in all Likelihood it came too late ; they had already divulged the Truth, as well from an Eagerness which all Men naturally have to tell a wonderful Story, as from a Desire of justifying themselves for having quitted their Post ; and that was, that the Angel of the Lord descended from Heaven, rolled back the Stone from the Door, and sat upon it : his Countenance was like Lightening, and his Raiment white as Snow ; and for fear of him the Keepers did shake, and became as dead Men. But upon the Circumstance of the Soldiers being cast into a Swoon or

H 2

‘ Trance,

‘ Trance, and consequently not having seen
 ‘ Jesus come out of the Sepulchre, construing
 ‘ this Swoon or Trance into a Sleep, with
 ‘ large Money, and Promises of Impunity,
 ‘ they hired the Soldiers to pretend a Crime,
 ‘ and by taking Shame to themselves to cover
 ‘ them from the Confusion *.

Object. ‘ If his real Body could appear, and
 ‘ disappear after the Resurrection, there was
 ‘ no Occasion for the Help of an Angel for
 ‘ opening the Tomb, and unsealing the Stone.’

P. 32, 33.

Milton gives an Account of the Nature and
 Strength of Angels in these Words :

_____ *Spirits, when they please,*
 _____ *In what Shape they chuse,*
Dilated or condens’d, bright or obscure,
Can Works of Love or Enmity fulfil.

According to which, this Angel had a Work
 of Love to fulfil to Christ, and of Enmity to
 his Enemies, the Soldiers, whom he came to
 fright away, that the Women, who were on
 their Way to the Sepulchre, his Disciples, and
 others who were to be there that Day, might
 have free Access thither, to have full Proof,
 that the Body was gone, and so be the better
 prepared

* Observations on the Hist. and Evid. of the Refurr.
 of Jesus Christ, by *Gilbert West*, Esq; p. 18, 19.

prepared to admit such other Proofs, as were afterwards to be given, that he was certainly risen from the Dead; which Proof had certainly been wanting without the Help of this Angel, though no earthly Power could have detained Christ in the Grave. His Work of Love to Christ was to do a proper Honour to him, by shewing that God was with him in this miraculous Event; and unanswerably refuted the impious Calumnies of those, who, because he claimed to be the Son of God, stiled him an Impostor and Blasphemer, and as such had crucified him.

α ' If Jesus and the Angel or Angels were at the Sepulchre, as well after as before the Men were there, why did they withdraw themselves at the Coming of *Peter* and *John* ? '

Answ. This proves no more, than that Angels are not always visible, and can appear and disappear as they think proper; and Jesus was doubtless then gone to meet the other *Mary* and *Salome*.

β ' *Matthew* mentions only one Angel; *Mark* calls him a young Man; *Luke* says two Men; but the Women called them Angels; *John* calls them two Angels. '

α Page 36.

β Ibid.

Answ.

Anfw. The Angel mentioned by St. *Matthew* sat without the Sepulchre upon the Stone; the one mentioned by St. *Mark* was within the Sepulchre; it is reasonable therefore to believe, that the Angel mentioned by *Matthew* got up off the Stone, and went into the Sepulchre, altered his Shape, and was the same with that mentioned by *Mark*; for the two Angels mentioned by *Luke*, (Verse 4.) and *John*, (Ver. 11, 12.) who were in the Sepulchre, they appeared at different Times, and to different Women.

γ ' If the Words, Touch me not, did not signify touch not my Body, what did they signify?

Anfw. They could not signify, make no Proof of the Reality of the Substance of my Body but by the Touch; but they signify a Prohibition from *Mary's* approaching to embrace or continue him, at a Time so unreasonable, but that afterwards there would be Time for that, before he ascended to his Father; at present she ought to make haste with a Message to his Brethren *.

Now

γ Page 36.

* Various are the Senses which Interpreters have been pleased to affix to the Reason, which our Lord here assigns, for his rejecting this Woman's Homage and Embraces: I am not yet ascended to my Father: Some imagine, that *Mary* still retaining her Notions of a temporal Kingdom,

Now that *Simon Peter*, who seems to be one of two, who knew him perfectly well before his Death, should not know him afterwards, is strange That Jesus should thus appear to two Disciples, and not be known, &c. He appeared to them in another Form, *Mark xii.* Whatever Form that was, if it was his real Person that appeared, the Form of that Person was the same.

Object. But their Eyes were holden, that they should not know him; then some mysterious

Kingdom, concluded, that our Lord was now risen on purpose to assume it; and therefore fell down to adore him; but that he, willing to raise her Mind to spiritual and celestial Thoughts, gave her to understand, that as yet it was not a proper Time for her to make her Addresses to him, because he was not yet ascended into Heaven, from whence he was to administer his Kingdom, and to send down the Holy Ghost, in order to form a spiritual Communion between him and his true Disciples. *Beausobre's Annotations.*

Others suppose, that this Woman imagined that our Lord was risen again in the same Manner that *Lazarus* did, viz. to live upon Earth, as he had done before; and that therefore, to convince her of the contrary, he bid her not touch him, as a mortal Man, because I am not yet ascended into Heaven, but in a short Time shall, and that is the Place where you are to pay me your Homage and Adorations. *Calmet's Commentary* Which excludes the Notion of our Saviour's frequent Ascensions during his Stay upon Earth after his Resurrection. *Hist. of the Bible*, p. 1454, 1495.

‘ mysterious Power had spoiled their Eye-
 ‘ fight.’

Ans. But they knew him afterwards †.

μ ‘ In common Cases Men may be allowed
 ‘ to be Eye-witnesses, and to see what they
 ‘ see; but in uncommon and miraculous Cases
 ‘ this can hardly be allowed: For when I
 ‘ have to do with one who has the Power of
 ‘ working Miracles, my Senses may be mira-
 ‘ culously wrought upon. In such Cases I
 ‘ may, and ought, as much to question the
 ‘ Truth of my Senses, as the Object.’

Ans. It is impossible, that the God of
 Truth, who only has the Power of working
 Miracles by himself or his Agents, who en-
 dows Men with all their Senses, that they
 might make a right Use of them, should by

† Whether it was, that after his Resurrection his Per-
 son was so considerably changed, that those who knew
 him before could not easily distinguish him, or that he
 appeared in a Habit quite different from what he used to
 wear, which for some time might hinder them from re-
 collecting who he was, or that he suspended the Opera-
 tion of their Senses, that he might have a better Oppor-
 tunity to instruct their Understandings; or that by an
 extraordinary Power he with-held their Eyes from per-
 ceiving, by which, upon removing that Impediment, they
 immediately knew him. Any of these Causes will answer
 the Purpose better than that we should impute (as some
 do) their not knowing their Master to their excessive
 Grief and Sorrow. *Calmet's Commentary, and Whitby's*
Annotations.

μ Page 47.

a Miracle pervert the right Use of Mens Senses, to make them believe, and impose upon others the Belief of a Lie, in an Affair of such Importance as Christ's Resurrection: To affirm which would be no less, than to make God himself the Author of that Lie, which it is impossible he should be. As sure then as God is true, he did really and truly raise up Christ from the Dead, which Christ himself promised he would do, and exhibit him to the View of those who had been chosen and commanded to be Witnesses thereof, and to publish it; thereby to confirm themselves and all the World in the Truth of his divine Mission and Doctrines, *Luke xxiv. 47.* And as a farther Confirmation of the Truth of their Testimony, he rendered those Witnesses themselves famous for Miracles wrought by them, which neither the *Jewish* Magistrates nor *Romans* could deny. As certainly then as God is true, the only Worker of Miracles *, so certainly we know their Eyes were not holden, and he seem to eat before them, when he did not.

St. Paul, 1 *Cor.* xv. 6. appeals to five hundred Brethren, as Witnesses of this Fact; and though he mentions not particularly who remained, and who were asleep, yet undoubtedly all those Circumstances were publicly

I

known

* See the preceding Note.

known at that Time, when he published this Epistle to the *Corinthians*, which was but twenty-four Years after the Appearance on the Mountain in *Galilee*; the same Appearance with this mentioned by him; and had not the Fact been notorious, he would hardly have ventured to make so publick an Appeal.

‘ *Matthew* and *Mark*, say the Disciples, were ordered to go into *Galilee*; *Luke* says, they were only reminded of what Jesus said in *Galilee*.’

I answer, in these Facts related by the Evangelists, are such Marks of Distinction, as plainly prove them to have been different from each other, and performed at different Times; for Instance, in St. *Luke*’s Account, first, the Womens seeing no Angels on their first Entrance into the Sepulchre; 2dly, their being much perplexed; 3dly, the Posture of the Angels, which was standing; 4thly, their saying to them Words which were so different from those mentioned by the other Evangelists to have been said to the Women; 5thly, *Peter*’s coming to the Sepulchre, and only stooping down and looking in, and seeing only the Linen Cloaths laid by themselves, and departing; whereas at the Time when he went, mentioned by St. *John*, he is not said to have stooped down, but to have gone into the

the Sepulchre, and seen the Linen Cloaths and the Napkin *. Which are all sufficient to keep any one from confounding the † Stories (*Luke* xxiv. 1. to 10.) of *Joanna*, the Angels, and *St. Peter*, with those concerning the *Marys*, the Angels, and that Disciple, related in the other Gospels; and therefore from charging the sacred Writers with Inconsistency and Contradiction.

§ *Object.* ‘ *St. Matthew*, (Chap. xvi.) *St. Mark*, (Chap. xiv.) and *St. Luke*, (Chap. xxiv. 36.) agree, that the Disciples met Jesus for the first and last Time, *ibidem*; so that *St. John*, the Author of the *Acts*, and *St. Paul*, contradict them.’

Ans. That Appearance mentioned by *St. Matthew* was not the same with that mentioned by *St. Mark* and *St. Luke*, but was subsequent to it, and in a different Place, that is, in *Galilee* on a Mountain.

|| *Object.* ‘ The Author of the *Acts* says, that Jesus was with the Disciples forty Days, *Luke* only one Day.’

Ans. Jesus appeared to *St. Thomas* at *Jerusalem* eight Days after that Time, when *St. Mark*, (Ver. 14.) and *St. Luke*, (Ver. 36.)

I 2

and

* Observations on the Hist. and Evidences of the Res.
p. 50 to 56.

† *H. Grotius*, de Ver. Relig. Christ. lib. iii. §. 13.

§ Page 40.

|| Page 41.

and himself, mention him to have appeared there; after which he departed into *Galilee*, and there continued, and appeared to his Disciples divers Times, until he returned to *Jerusalem*; and for the last Time there appeared to them upon the Day of his ascending; which, together with the Time of his Absence in *Galilee*, joined with that in which he remained at *Jerusalem*, immediately after the Resurrection, make up the forty Days † mentioned by St. *Luke*. This appears by what St. *John* says of his Appearance by the Sea of *Tiberias*, called also the Sea of *Galilee* *; which *John* (Chap. xxi. 14.) says is the third Time that Jesus shewed himself to his Disciples, after that he was risen from Dead. As likewise from what St. *Matthew* says of his Appearance in *Galilee* on a Mountain; and hence are we enabled to answer that Cavil.

‘ *John* tells us of more Appearances than the other Evangelists do, of Jesus to his Disciples *John*’s Evidence destroys theirs, or theirs destroy his; since neither of the two last mentioned by St. *John* are at all mentioned by any other of the Evangelists; nor those which St. *Matthew* mentions, by any of the other three; and one mentioned by

† Acts i.

* Observations on the Hist. and Evid. of the Resurrec.
p. 263, 289.

‡ Pag. 45, 48.

by one of the other two †, by none of the others, each selecting such as best suited the Purpose they had in view, when they wrote their Gospels.

” *Object.* ‘ St. Mark and St. Luke say the Eleven were gathered together, when Jesus appeared among them, and John says, that one of them was absent.’ Neither does this contradict the others; for by the Eleven is undoubtedly understood the Society, or Majority of the Apostles *, altho’ at that Juncture one might be absent, i. e. *Thomas*.

λ ‘ It is urged, according to St. John, Ch. xx. 19. Jesus stood in the Midst, when the Doors were shut, where the Disciples were assembled;

† Mark xvi. 9.

” Page 70.

λ Page 43.

* What might be the Occasion of this Apostle’s Absence, is variously conjectured: Some are of Opinion, that as all fled from their Master, when he was apprehended in the Garden, they did not so soon assemble again, but by degrees dropped in one by one, as they recovered from their Fright; and that therefore at this Time *Thomas* was not returned to the Company. Others, from the natural Temper of this Apostle, as it appears from the Scripture Passages, wherein he is represented to be very scrupulous, and hard of Belief, do rather think, that taking Offence at the Apostles easy Credulity, and looking upon all the Women from the Sepulchre, and the two Disciples from *Emmaus*, had said, as so many idle Tales, he left the Company in pure Disgust, not long before our Saviour came into the Room. *Calmet’s Commentary*, and *Young’s Sermons*, Vol. ii.

‘ assembled; that one solid or material Body
 ‘ passed through another solid or material
 ‘ Body, without injuring the Form of either,
 ‘ both passive, and the passing Body remaining
 ‘ the same.’

I answer, our Saviour by his sovereign Power miraculously opened the Door himself; even as the Angel did the Prison Gates to release *Peter* secretly, and without the Perception of any in the Company, who might all then be at the upper End of the Room perhaps, and employed in some such Business as took up their whole Attention *. For unless we can suppose that our Saviour designed to invalidate the Strength of what he said and did, *i. e.* by offering his Body to the Examination of their Senses, to convince them that he was bodily risen from the Dead; we cannot suppose that he would at the same Time deceive them by doing Things inconsistent with his Character, as Christ of God, by either exhibiting a spiritual Body to their Senses, or imposing miraculously on them, by substituting a mere Idea of what he said he was, *i. e.* him himself, occasioned by the illusory and subordinate Evidence of Sensations imprinted miraculously on their Minds.

* See *Whitby's Annotat.* on *John* xx. 19. *Observat.* on the *Hist. and Evid. of the Resurr.* by *Gilbert West, Esq;* p. 202. to 209.

Object. 'Suffering for the asserting a Fact
' is no more the Proof of a Fact, than of
' Doctrines; nor is it any more the Proof of
' Sincerity, than of Obstinacy.'

Ans^w. In suffering for Doctrines the Sufferer may be, and frequently is deceived; and his Partiality, Precipitation of Judgment, neglecting or refusing to apply himself to proper Means for the Removal of his Biasses or Prejudices, and instructing his Understanding, is then a Proof of his Obstinacy, and Want of Sincerity. But in suffering for asserting this Fact, the Senses of the Witnesses thereof, after so many Experiments as they had made, must have been competent Judges; to the Evidence of which their Lord himself appealed for the Truth of it, and by that Appeal allowed them to be so; who could not, consistently with his Character, intend to deceive them. In this Case they must have been impartial in every View, free from all Biasses or Prejudices, culpable Neglects, or Precipitation of Judgment; and therefore their suffering for the asserting it, must have been a Proof of their Sincerity †.

λ 'It is not upon the Credit of the
' Women, that we believe Angels were con-
' cerned,

κ Page 58.

λ Page 56.

† See Dr. *Waterland's* Importance of the Doctrine of the Trinity, p. 159, 162.

‘ cerned, but upon the Report of those who
 ‘ wrote the Gospels.

Object. ‘ Those who wrote the Gospels
 ‘ knew nothing of it themselves.’

Ans. Jesus had several Times foretold to his Disciples his suffering Death, and Resurrection, in Words so plain, that had they not been under the Prejudices afore-mentioned, it would have been impossible for them to have mistaken them; yet the Evangelists tell us, they either did not understand, or did not believe them. And the Women, by their extraordinary Preparations for embalming the Lord’s Body, and going to the Sepulchre with Intent to embalm it, plainly shew they had no Expectation of any Resurrection; yet the Evangelists tell us, that these same Women, in different Companies, some with Trembling, Fear, and Joy, flee from the Sepulchre, report to the Apostles, from the Angels, the several Predictions relating to this Event, which they could not fail to recollect, nor therefore to give Credit to their Reports; especially as the Truth thereof was confirmed to them by seeing Jesus afterwards; and as no other Reason can be assigned for their Fear, but what themselves mention, therefore, as is said above, it is upon the Report of the Evangelists only, that we believe Angels were concerned.

‘ The

μ ‘ The chief Priests try to murder the
 ‘ Apostles, enter into Combinations to assassi-
 ‘ nate them, prevail with *Herod* to put one
 ‘ of them to Death; but not so much as a
 ‘ Charge against them of any Fraud in the
 ‘ Resurrection.

Object. ‘ Because they themselves had not
 ‘ mentioned it.’

Answer. We find them several Times teach-
 ing this Doctrine ν; and that *Peter* ο was im-
 prisoned for it; and they put them to Death
 for it. Because their Hearts were hardened,
 their Ears dull of Hearing, and their Eyes
 closed, *Matt.* xiii. 15. Were resolved not to
 be convinced, nor cut π to the Heart any more
 by hearing their own Guilt.

σ ‘ Nothing is more apparently absurd,
 ‘ than to make one Man’s Ability in discern-
 ‘ cerning, and Veracity in reporting plain
 ‘ Facts, depend upon the Skill or Ignorance
 ‘ of the Hearer.

τ *Object.* ‘ Yet, if something be reported
 ‘ to me, or imposed on me for Truth, which
 ‘ appears the less to be so, the more I exa-
 ‘ mine into it, must I deny my discerning
 ‘ Faculties and make them depend
 ‘ upon the Art or Authority of the Reporter

K

‘ or

μ Trial of the Witnesses, p. 49.

ν Acts iii. 15. x. 40. ii. 32.

ο Acts ii. 12. π Acts vii. 54.

σ Trial of the Witnesses, p. 60.

τ Ibid. p. 61.

‘ or Impostor : If the plain Fact reported be a plain Absurdity to my Sense and Understanding should I renounce the Evidence of what Senses are alone capable of trying it.’

Answ. The Senses and Understanding of no particular private Person, who might be diverted by Prejudice, blinded by Ignorance, or hardened by Obstinacy, from perceiving or acknowledging the Truth, are, or ever were to judge, and absolutely to determine for themselves and all Mankind, concerning the Truth of this Fact, who have all the Use of their Senses and Understandings to judge for themselves. And by the sudden and extensive Progress of Christianity it appears, that it was believed by Christians of all Places and Times, and alledged as the especial Foundation of their Faith, as Christ before his Death foretold of what Kind it should be, and his Resurrection, and that they should be to assure the World of the Truth of his divine Mission and Doctrine, *John xvii. Luke xxiv. 46, 47.*

S E R M. II.

Of Free-will and Predestination.

ROMANS viii. 14.

As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the Sons of God.

WE have in this Chapter the Works of the Flesh and of the Spirit set in Opposition to each other; and that eternal Death, which is the Wages of the former, to eternal Life, with which those are to be rewarded, who do the Works of the Spirit, or are led by the Spirit of God, by which is meant doing his Will, for the Spirit of God is himself. In the Words of the Text we may observe,

- I. A certain Number elected, *as many as are led by the Spirit of God*; and,
- II. What they are elected to be, *they are the Sons of God.*

As to the former it will be proper to observe, first, that though some are led by the Spirit of God, yet all reasonable Creatures are by

Nature free Agents, allowed to follow the Dictates of their Reason in Matters of Religion; and,

2dly, That his leading to all good, and the Want of it in all evil Works, does not derogate from that Freedom of Will and Use of Reason.

First, I am to observe, that all reasonable Creatures are free Agents, and allowed to follow the Dictates of their Reason in Matters of Religion.

As he hath put all reasonable Creatures upon some Difficulties, Trials, and Proofs of their Virtues, that he might reward or punish them according to their Obedience or Disobedience to his Laws, he certainly hath given them a Free-will in both Respects; otherwise they could give no Proof of their Faith, Obedience, and Love to him, when they act not by Choice, but by Compulsion: From such Obedience they could neither merit Praise or Dispraise, Reward or Punishment *, nor could God take any Delight therein. For if a Man performed all his Actions by Compulsion, all Precepts and legal Prohibitions were useless; and hence also all Application to Learning and Instruction, or the understanding of any particular Arts; since it would be impossible that, being forced by an external Violence, according to those who are of that Opinion, he should not perform such an Action, understand such

* Justinus Apologet. ii.

a Science, or be taught in such Morals. And for the same Reason Reward or Punishment would be nothing but a manifest Injury, whether they proceed from any of ourselves to each other, or from God to us. And how does it become a just and equitable Being to take Vengeance on a Creature for a Deed done by him through Necessity, and which he could not have forborn doing, although he should have endeavoured it? And likewise all the Labours of Men would be fruitless, while they build Houses, provide Sustenance, shun Dangers, &c. if what is decreed, that it should be done, cannot be undone. But this is absolutely false, contradicts Sense and Reason, overthrows the Foundation of Law, and charges God with Injustice, to which he hath the uttermost Aversion. The Truth is, that Mankind hath a Free-will in the Choice of all their Actions; and therefore it is expedient, that Precepts should be, wherefore God says, *Deut. xxx. 15.* See, I have set before thee this Day Life and Good, and Death and Evil. *Ver. 19.* Therefore chuse Life. *Ver. 17.* But if thine Heart turn away, (*Ver. 18.*) I denounce unto you this Day, that ye shall surely perish. So *Deut. iv. 9, 10.* Only take heed to thyself, and keep thy Soul diligently, lest thou forget the Things which thine Eyes have seen, and lest they depart from thy Heart all the Days of thy Life: But teach them thy Sons, and thy Sons Sons, That they may learn to fear
me

me all the Days that they shall live upon the Earth; and that they may teach their Children. Enjoining us likewise to make all necessary Provisions by way of Precaution, as *Deut.* xxii. 8. When thou buildest a new House, thou shalt make a Battlement for thy Roof, that thou bring not Blood upon thine House, if any Man fall from thence. *Deut.* xxiv. 6. Thou shalt not take a Pledge.

* רחמים ורכב ונ:

Though God hath delivered these Precepts to us, he hath not absolutely decreed, that we should either obey or transgress them, but left either to our Choice, inviting us to Obedience by Rewards, and deterring us by Punishments from Disobedience: This is the Substance of what the Prophet says, *Lam.* iii. 38, 39. Out of the Mouth of the most High proceedeth not Evil and Good: Wherefore doth a living Man complain, a Man for the Punishment of his Sins? since they proceed from his own Choice, not from God; so that Men ought to be sorry for and bewail the Sins and Offences which they themselves have committed, since they have sinned of their own Accord; therefore it is in their Power to repent, and turn from their evil Ways; for he saith afterwards, *Ver.* 40, 41. Let us search and try our Ways, and turn again to the Lord. Let us lift up our Heart with our Hands unto God in the Heavens,

Agreeable

* Maimon. *Porta Mosis*, p. 236.

Agreeable to this is the Sense of the *Chaldee* Paraphraſt of thoſe Words, *Gen.* iii. 22. Behold, the Man is become as one of us, to know Good and Evil, *i. e.* He is one Species in the World to which no other is like, which communicates with him in that Reſpect which hath happened to him, and what Reſpect is that? he knows Good or Evil of his own Judgment, and may chuſe which of them he will, being hindered by none; which, ſince it is ſo, he may ſtretch forth his Hand, and take of the Tree, and eat, and live for ever.

But that this Doctrine may not ſeem irreconcilable with that in the Text, of many being led by the Spirit, and to that Text where God is ſaid to work in us both to will and to do of his good Pleaſure,

2dly, I ſhall ſhew, that this leading of the Spirit of God to all good, and the Want of it in our evil Works, does not derogate from that Freedom of Will and Uſe of Reaſon.

Men may be led by many Spirits, yet not by the true Spirit of God, as Chriſt tells the furious Diſciple, *Luke* ix. 55. Ye know not what Manner of Spirit ye are of. He was of a revengeful, malicious Spirit; and ſuch a one hath no Share in the Benefits of the Goſpel of the meek and holy Jeſus.

One may be led by the Spirit of Error, or by an enthuſiaſtick Spirit, or by the Spirit of Giddineſs and Phrenſy, or, as all theſe are, by that unclean Spirit the Devil.

What

What Heresies have not been broached, and Wickednesses committed, and all under Presence of the dictating of the Spirit! In order therefore to know when we are led by the true Spirit of God, we must understand,

First, That God's Spirit leads none to believe or act contrary to his Laws written and delivered by his Prophets, Apostles and Evangelists; who therefore resist his sacred Influence, and grieve him by wilful Impurities. On the contrary, we are told by the Apostle, *2 Tim. iii. 16, 17.* That the Scripture is given by his Inspiration, and is profitable for Doctrine, for Reproof, for Correction, for Instruction in Righteousness: That the Man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good Works. Therefore, if we have learned from the Scriptures so much Knowledge of God, as is necessary to possess our Minds with right Apprehensions of his Majesty, and of Christ, as to apprehend the great Mystery of our Redemption by him. If we have a sound Judgment in the fundamental Articles of the Christian Faith, and in all the necessary Duties required in the Gospel. If with pure and sincere Hearts we believe all those Articles as revealed, and perform all those Duties as required of God, endeavouring earnestly to cultivate and improve all pious Dispositions; then the Spirit of God, the Almighty Author of all good Gifts, condescends not only to visit, but to dwell within us; the glorious Day springs from

from on high, guides our Understandings into all saving Truths; and efficaciously leads and inclines our Will and Affections to a zealous and ardent Pursuit after all Goodness. But in effecting this, we are not purely passive, moved and excited to Virtue and Holiness by an irresistible Power, because this would turn all the Commands and Exhortations, Promises and Threatenings of God, into a solemn Piece of Pageantry; but are wrought upon in such a Way as is suitable to our Nature, endowed with a Faculty of Understanding to distinguish between Good and Evil, and with Freedom of Will to make our Chance; and consequently the Operations of the Spirit are neither such as render the Actions of the one intirely useless, nor such as are utterly inconsistent with the Liberty of the other: But by moving upon the Soul in a most familiar Way, scarce discernible by us from our own natural Reasoning, and the Operations of Truth upon our Minds, the holy Spirit gradually dispels all Clouds of Ignorance, Error and Prejudice, clears up our Apprehensions of the chiefest Good, enlightens our Understandings, rectifies our Wills, awakens our Conscience, subdues our inordinate Passions, sanctifies our Griefs, refines our Joys *, softens our Hearts, humbles our Spirits, weakens the Strength of our Sins, and † strengthens the Weakness of our Virtue.

L

And

* Acts xvi. 14.

† Gal. v. 22, 23.

And as by his Inspiration he revealed to us the divine Will, so doth he enable us both to know and to do that Will; for though it is true, that the Things required of us to believe and practise, are plainly expressed, yet they are either so far above our Apprehensions, as not to be conceived by us, or so contrary to our corrupt Nature, as not to be obeyed, unless we are taught and led by the same Spirit that inspired those sacred Truths: For the natural Man receiveth not the Things of the Spirit, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned, *1 Cor. ii. 14.* and as in *Rom. viii. 7, 8.* Because the carnal Mind is Enmity against God; for it is not subject to the Law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the Flesh cannot please God.

But some may make an Objection against this Doctrine, that God is said to chuse or reject Persons or People antecedently to their respective Actions; therefore they seem to be pre-ordained or necessitated: The Sense wherein God is said to chuse or reject Persons or People, antecedently to their respective Actions, is as follows; *St. Paul* was reasoning with the *Romans*, (chap. ix.) that God might as well, and justly reject the *Jews* from being his People, as he once had chosen them to be so; that he had as much Right, in the Case of the Gentiles, to call them his People, which were not his People, and her beloved,
which

which was not beloved, as he had in the Case of the *Israelites* before them ; that as he loved *Jacob*, and hated *Esau*, so the Time might come, when his Love should be suspended from the one, and his Hatred be removed from the other. For both there were, doubtless, wise, though hidden Reasons ; and it was enough to silence the bold Objector, that God would have Mercy on whom he will have Mercy ; that like a Potter, he hath Power over the Clay, to make of the same Lump one Vessel unto Honour, and another unto Dishonour. But this whole Procedure respected only the outward Privileges of the Church Militant upon Earth, *i. e.* God would vouchsafe the Favour of his Oracles, where, and as he pleased, without accounting to his Creatures for his several Dispensations.

The Apostle's Argument required him to say no more ; and the whole Course of it extends no farther, than to the Removal of those Prejudices, which the *Jews* had conceived against the Admission of the Gentiles into his Church and Household ; with the State of particular Persons in another World ; neither the Argument itself, nor any Expressions used in it, speak him to have meddled ; that was still left to turn upon the Use they should make of the Light afforded them, when the Measure of their Helps and Hindrances should be fairly adjusted. It is of great Importance to the Interests of Virtue, that the Dealings of God, respecting

our present and future State, should not be confounded with each other; that he should not be represented as distributing his final Awards of Judgment or Mercy, without any Regard to the Behaviour of the Persons concerned in them; that his Purposes of Election should not appear to have any farther View, than the Privilege of some external Advantages vouchsafed to one People before, and rather than another; that he should not be thought to have any particular Favourites in the Kingdom of Glory, who become not so by a previous Trial and Approbation in some or other of the manifold Methods of Grace. As to the Variety of those Methods, and the Difference of Opportunities wherewith different Persons at different Times are put upon the Test and Trial of their several Virtues, we can easily conceive a Day may come, when all of them shall be adjusted by a righteous and impartial Judgment: Our Part is to improve mean while the Talents lent to us by a gracious Providence, and as we have received the Light, to walk in it, to live as becomes a People whom the God and Father of our Lord and Saviour hath vouchsafed to enrich with all spiritual Blessings in heavenly Things, through Christ. It is by our Faith in him, Repentance, and serious Endeavours, by God's preventing and assisting Grace, which will not be denied to those who pray earnestly for it, as they ought to do, to live in Obedience to the Gospel, that
we

we can approve ourselves to be the Elect of God ; since on these gracious Terms Salvation is there offered to all, and all are in a Capacity to attain it, because it is in their Power, by a right Use of his Grace, to lead a godly, righteous and sober Life, and to prevent Mischance by their wilful Disobedience : So then, whether we are predestinated to everlasting Life or Destruction, depends only upon our own voluntary good or ill Actions and Behaviour in the Point of Time allotted us in this Life, according to the seventeenth Article of our Religion :

That those who be endowed with so excellent a Benefit of God, *i. e.* to be delivered from Curse and Damnation, being chosen of God in Christ out of Mankind, and brought by Christ to everlasting Salvation, as Vessels made to Honour, according as he hath constantly decreed by his Counsel, by his everlasting Purpose before the Foundation of the World, be called according to God's Purpose by his Spirit working in due Season ; they through Grace, *i. e.* the free Favour and Love of God in Christ, and a lively Sense thereof in their own Souls, obey the Calling, *i. e.* are true Believers ; they be justified freely ; by the same Grace too they be made Children of God by Adoption, and have a Right to a heavenly Inheritance, and partake of all the Privileges of Children ; they be made like the Image of his only-begotten Son Jesus Christ ; they walk religiously

religiously in all good Works, *i. e.* of Faith, Repentance, and Obedience; they know the Truth, and live according to it, as a necessary Condition of their Election, and all by Grace too preventing us, that we may have a good Will *, and working with and assisting us, when we have that good Will, without which we have no Power by our own natural Strength to do good Works, pleasant and acceptable to God: For though to will is from Nature, to will good and well is from Grace; and at length by God's Mercy they attain to everlasting Felicity.

And as in godly Persons feeling the working of the Spirit of Christ, mortifying the Works of the Flesh and their earthly Members, and working Righteousness in them, the godly Consideration of Predestination and Election in Christ is full of sweet, pleasant and unspeakable Comfort. To curious and carnal Persons lacking the Spirit of Christ, and so † are none of his, to have continually before their Eyes the Sentence of God's Predestination, is a most dangerous Downfal, whereby the Devil doth thrust them either into Desperation, or into Wretchlessness of most unclean Living, no less perilous than Desperation.

We must receive God's Promises in such wise, as they be generally set forth to us in holy Scripture. And in our Doings, that Will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared unto us in the Word of God.

Which

* Art. of Relig. x.

† Rom. viii. 9.

Which last Words teach us, that though it is God's Grace does all! for us, in us, and by us, and works all our good Works, being guided and acted in our Wills, Affections, Inclinations, Words, and Actions, by his Conduct, Motions and Impulses, it is he that worketh in us both to will and to do; yet he is obliged to give it upon Condition, that we ask and expect it, as we ought, in the Use of those Means he hath appointed for the begetting and increasing of it; we must will and do and work out our Salvation, and not expect Miracles from irresistible Grace.

How rigid and uncomfortable, how presumptuous and uncharitable, is that Doctrine of absolute Election, Predestination, and Reprobation, that God from all Eternity, upon the Foresight or Predetermination [of the Sin and Fall of Man] resolved with himself, out of an especial Grace, to single out some few from the common Mass of Mankind, and to ordain them for Life and Salvation; and then for the Sake only of those few, to send his Son Christ, the Mediator of the new Covenant, with a Commission to work out the Redemption only of those few, the Elect, passing by all the rest of the World, and leaving them to perish. Their fundamental Mistake, who broached this Doctrine, was, that they made the Decree of Election antecedent to the Covenant with Christ, which itself is called the Decree, *Pf. ii. 7.*

* It

* It seems to reflect upon the Justice, as well as other Attributes of God, who disavows all Partiality in his Proceedings, telling us that he is no Respector of Persons, and that he will render to all according to their Deeds; and as much to disparage and eclipse the Glories of our Saviour's all-sufficient Merit, by restraining the Influence of that common Salvation which he hath wrought for us, and by making his Person and Undertaking to truckle under the Limitation of a foregoing Decree; on the contrary, to say that God from all Eternity, upon the Foresight of the Fall, out of a merciful Sense [that the Law, or the Spirit of God in Scripture, would discover and declare all Men by Nature, by the Fall, to be guilty of Sin, and in a State of Damnation] did, by an everlasting Covenant, engage his Son to satisfy for the Sins of all, and to purchase Life for them; and then, according to the Terms of that Covenant [the Conditions whereof on our Side are Repentance, Faith, and new Obedience] did decree to save all true Believers, and was obliged to take them into the Election of Grace that should perform those Conditions, and make use of those Means he hath afforded us, and to condemn all others for their Unbelief, Impenitence and Disobedience. That he has not by any fore-ruling Decree forestalled our Way to Happiness,

* See *Littleton's Sermons* on 1 *Tim.* ii. 4. and Dedication.

piness, but left it open and free to all that will come, and calls upon us by his Word and Spirit to come, and courts us with great Importunity to Happiness. That Election, an Act of free Grace, for Christ's Sake and by his Means, upon account of that Covenant he made with the Father in our Behalf and Stead, is in its Nature conditional, and so is ordered not according to God's absolute Will, but his good Pleasure in Christ. This speaks the true Sense of the Gospel, the glad Tidings of Salvation; this acquits God's Mercy, his Justice and Truth; this gives his Son the Glory of his Merit and his Grace, and at once presses home the Obligations of Duty upon the Children of Men.

Another Objection is taken from such Texts of Scripture, whence it seems, as if Sinners were decreed, and by Violence forced to sin, which is absolutely false: In the Number of these are what he says to *Abraham*, *Gen. xv. 13.* Thy Seed shall be a Stranger in a Land that is not theirs, and shall serve them, and they shall afflict them. Here he decreed that the *Egyptians* should injure the Seed of *Abraham*; why therefore did he take Vengeance on them, when by fatal and inevitable Necessity they reduced them into Servitude, as he had decreed? I answer, this is even as if God had said, Among those who will be born, there will be Transgressors and Obedient, some Virtuous, others Wicked; neither is any, for

this Saying, compelled to be either good or evil ; but he may chuse to be which of them he will ; and any one of the *Egyptians*, who oppressed and injured them, if it had been his Choice, might have forborn so to do.

As to those Sayings of his, *Exod. iv. 21.* But I will harden his Heart, that he shall not let the People go. Chap. x. 1. For I have hardened his Heart, and the Heart of his Servants ; then required that he should let those go, whom he was compelled not to suffer to go, and because he did not let them go, destroyed both him and his People. I answer, this indeed would seem like Injustice, had he and his People been guilty of no other Offence, than not suffering them to go ; but they had a former voluntary wicked Purpose and Design against that People, which appears from the Words of *Pharaoh, Exod. i. 9, 10, 11.* And he said unto his People, Behold, the People of the Children of *Israel* are mo and mightier than we. Come on, let us deal wisely with them. Therefore they did set over them Task-masters to afflict them ; God therefore punished them with Hardness of Heart and Deprivation of Freedom ; a Punishment adequate to his Justice, and their Crime in continuing obstinately to oppress his People. It was just in him to withdraw his Grace from them, and harden their Hearts, who had all along, under a Course of Judgment, hardened themselves ; and to set them
up

up for a Trophy of his Justice, who had hitherto lived a Monument of his Mercy, and despised his Goodness and Forbearance, which should have led them to Repentance.

Had he only designed to bring his People out, he might first have destroyed *Pharaoh* and his People; but it was his Pleasure, at the same Time he led his own People out, to punish the others for their former Sins, and Injuries they did them, by destroying them utterly, that so he might make his Power known by some signal Vengeance on them, that his Name might be declared throughout all the Earth: In which Case was a famous Miracle, apparent to all, that he punished the Man by hindering him from doing a Thing freely, when himself knew it, nor could rescue his Mind, and restore it to Liberty.

The Punishment of *Sibon*, King of *Heshbon*, was quite the same for his former Oppression and Injustice, with which he reigned without Compulsion; which Punishment was, that he would not permit *Israel* to go through his Kingdom, as we read *Numb.* xxi. 23, 24. And *Sibon* would not suffer *Israel* to pass through his Border: And *Israel* smote him with the Edge of the Sword, and possessed his Land.

The Prophet *Isaiab* declares, that God punisheth some Transgressors by restraining them from Repentance until the Measure of their Iniquities is filled, and then he pours out his severest Judgments on them. *Isaiab* vi. 10.

Make the Heart of this People fat, and make their Ears heavy, and shut their Eyes, lest they see with their Eyes, and hear with their Ears, and understand with their Heart, and convert and be healed. With this Doctrine agreeth that Saying of *Elias* concerning the Infidels of his Time, *Kings* xviii. 37. Thou hast turned their Heart back again, *i. e.* this was thy Punishment against them, after they had voluntarily strayed, that thou removedst their Hearts from the Way of Repentance, and that they should have no Free-will to forsake their Rebellion, but remain in their Infidelity. So *Hosea* iv. 17. *Ephraim* is joined to idols; let him alone, *i. e.* he was a Friend to Idols of his own Accord; and his Punishment is, that he should be given up, suffered to worship them.

A third Objection is, by the divine Foreknowledge of all the future Actions of Men their Wills are over-ruled, and disposed as by a kind of absolute Decree, to the performing such Actions, or the Omission of others; so that they cannot be done or omitted, otherwise than according to Predestination and Foreknowledge. To this it may be answered, that this Foreknowledge of God hath not the least Influence on the Actions or Omissions of Men, which, upon the Supposition that they were unforeknown, would be no less certain.

‘ And in the Performance of Man’s Duty,
 ‘ and Permission of his Sin, however fore-
 ‘ seen,

' seen, that Exercise of human Liberty is con-
 ' sulted, which is necessary to the Denomina-
 ' tion of Vice or Virtue; though with this
 ' there may be other Views of Providence
 ' coincident, respecting the Trial of some,
 ' and the Punishment of others; the Produce
 ' of Good from Evil, and the Triumphs of
 ' divine Justice over great Offenders, as in
 ' Pharaoh's Case. Mean while, whatever the
 ' present Forbearance of God may be to them,
 ' his final Vengeance is sure of meeting with
 ' them, if they do not prevent it by a timely
 ' Repentance; which is Reason enough to
 ' them for entering with the soonest upon
 ' proper Steps to it; and at the same Time
 ' vindicates the Providence of God for any
 ' little Successes attending them in the inte-
 ' rim.' *Marshal's Sermons, Vol. iii.*

——— ——— ——— *He had of me*
All he could have: I made him just and right,
Sufficient to have stood, tho' free to fall.
Such I created all the ethereal Powers
And Spirits, both them who stood, and them who
fell:
Freely they stood who stood, and fell who fell.

Milt. Par. Lost, B. iii. l. 97, &c.
 The Knowledge of God is of a different
 Nature from that of Man: Man's Knowledge
 is different from himself; but God does not
 know by any such Knowledge; God's Know-
 ledge and other Attributes are the same with
 himself,

himself, essential to him; therefore the *Hebrew* Tongue does not say the Life of God, as they say the Life of Man, or of *Pharaoh*, but *chai Adonai*, the living God, he, and his Knowledge, and Life, being the same: And both Philosophy and Scripture assure us,* it is impossible for our Understandings perfectly to comprehend the Essence of God, by reason of the Perfection of his Essence, and the Defect of our Understandings, which in apprehending him is like the Defect of the Sight of the Eye to discern the Light of the Sun, which is occasioned not through the Weakness of the Light of the Sun, but because that is stronger than the Light which would discern it. † If therefore he foreknows our Actions, it is by a Knowledge incomprehensible to us, and therefore we can pronounce nothing in this Respect from the Knowledge of God, by reason of our own Ignorance of it: ‡ Wherefore he charges it as a Sin in those, who desire to apprehend his Knowledge, saying, *Job* xi. 7. Canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty to Perfection?

Since therefore People are not forced of God to sin against their own Reason, otherwise than as a Punishment against them, for first

* Maimon. *Porta Mosis*, p. 258.

† Ibid. p. 254, 255, 256, 257.

‡ Ibid. p. 257.

first wilfully resisting the Dictates of it, enslaving themselves to their inordinate Passions, for which God in his just Judgment withdraws his Grace from them, which always co-operates with, not contradicts or opposeth right Reason. This is a Proof, that we should weigh with unprejudiced Minds, and study the Doctrines and Duties of our Religion, as Matters of the uttermost Importance, begging of him to send us the Light of his holy Spirit, to teach us to have a right Judgment in what we are to believe and practise, and to incline our Wills to a ready Conformity and Obedience thereto: Since, *Gal. vi. 7.* Whatsoever a Man soweth, that shall he also reap. Of what Kind or Nature soever his Works are, of the same shall be his Reward. As in *Rom. viii. 13.* If ye live after the Flesh, ye shall die eternally, and never partake of that glorious Reward, which otherwise you might do: But if ye through the Spirit do mortify the Deeds of the Body, ye shall live; if by his Grace and Assistance ye resist, subdue and destroy the Power of Sin more and more, all carnal Affections, whence all the corrupt Deeds, wherein the Body is instrumental, do arise, ye shall live a comfortable, vigorous, and spiritual Life here, and shall obtain eternal Life hereafter.

I shall conclude this Discourse with Parts of two Collects joined together.

* O God,

* O God, the Strength of all them that put their Trust in thee, mercifully accept our Prayers; and because, through the Weakness of our mortal Nature, we can do no good Thing without thee, grant us the Help of thy Grace, that in keeping thy Commandments, we may please thee both in Will and Deed :
 † That we being regenerate, and made thy Children by Adoption and Grace, may daily be renewed by thy Holy Spirit, through the same our Lord Jesus Christ, who liveth and reigneth with thee and the same Spirit, ever one God, World without End. *Amen.*

* Collect for the first Sunday after *Trinity*.

† Collect for *Christmas* Day.

C H A P. I.

A Vindication of the Twenty-eighth Article of Religion.

THE two particular Words made use of by the Evangelists, to denote what our Lord did, when he consecrated the Elements of his Holy Supper, were *Ἐυχαριστία*, Thanksgiving, and *Ἐυλογία*, Blessing. And as the ancient Fathers and primitive Christians have been very desirous always to imitate him in the Manner of their Consecration, great Disputes have continually arose, in what Words it did properly consist. Some ascribed it to the Words of Institution, *This is my Body*; others to Prayers, which they called by the Names above-mentioned; and according to the Greek and Eastern, as well as the most ancient Latin Churches, these were made by the *Ἐπίκλησις πνεύματος ἁγίου*, *i. e.* the Invocation of the Holy Ghost upon the Elements; those who maintained the latter, with just Reason, deny the former to be well grounded; for those Words having been spoke at the Distribution, suppose the Consecration already past; yet this hath been maintained by some of the

N

ancient

ancient Fathers, and other Writers. I shall here produce only the Testimony of one *John Phurnes*, or whoever he is, who is the Author of a Book or Epistle *, *Of the Rites changed in the Communion.*

Ἄλλα μὲν τὸν ἄρτον ὁρῶμεν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἁγιαζόμενον ἐν τῷ μόνῳ ἀπλῶς ἐπιλέγεσθαι· τὸ ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κλόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, ὡς ἀπὸ τῆς διδασκαλίας δηλαδὴ παρειλήφεισαν ἄνευ τῆς νῦν γενομένης ἐν ἱστανίᾳ· ἱεροτελεστίας ἀκολουθίας τῶν προαναφωρισμένων Προφητικῶν ἀλαλαγμάτων, Ἀποστολικῶν τε καὶ εὐαγγελικῶν κηρυγμάτων καὶ τῶν προλεγομένων καὶ ἐπιλεγόμενων ἱερῶν ἑυχῶν. But we see the Bread of Benediction sanctified by the Apostles only by their saying, This is the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, broken for you for the Remission of Sins, as they received them from their Master, without that well composed, consecrative Series now made, and those first sung, Prophetic Hymns, and Apostical and Evangelical Orations now in Use, and those before and after repeated, sacred Prayers; which Doctrine is directly contrary to what *St. Chrysostom*, *Proclus*, and *St. Basil* teach, concerning the Consecration of the Apostles and Saints.

As to the Opinion which maintained, that it was performed by the two Words *Εὐχαριστία* and *Εὐλογία*, although there is no Doubt to be made, but that these Words were derived from the Words of Consecration in the *Jewish Rite*

* Leo Allat. Eccl. Occid. atque Or. per Con. l. 3. c. 13. §. 7. p. 15.

Rite of the Passover, in which our Lord did as the *Jews* used to do, *i. e.* give Thanks to and bless his Father, by the Oblation of these his Creatures unto him, using the like, or the same Form of Words, which they did, Blessed be thou, O Lord our God, King of the World, who bringest forth Bread out of the Earth, over the Bread; and blessed be thou, O Lord our God, King of the World, who created the Fruit of the Vine, over the Cup. Yet these Words only do not suffice to the Institution of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, and doubtless our Lord added others.

But all that we can conclude from the Words of Institution, as related by the Evangelists and *St. Paul*, is *, That Christ, after giving Thanks, whereby he praised his Father for those Eucharistical Gifts created for the Use of Man, prayed, which the Word *Ευλογία*, Blessing, denotes; whereby, with his Prayers, he offered, dedicated, and consecrated them to God; beseeching him likewise, that he would sanctify them for their Use; and that by his Omnipotent Virtue, and the Operation of his Holy Spirit, they may be made the Sacrament of his Body and Blood, which by that Action was instituted; by that divine Communion whereby a terrestrial Thing is joined with a celestial, in Memory of his Death and Passion.

* Joh. Ger. Loc. Theol. de fac. Coen. §. 147.

Erasmus of *Rotterdam* wisheth, that the Scripture had expressed to us, with what Words Christ consecrated, and with what we ought to consecrate. *Notes on 1 Cor. xi.* But had he intended any set Form for the Direction of the Church in future Ages, it is very probable, that he would have delivered it in Writing, especially to *St. Paul*, who, apart from the other Disciples, and Apostles of Jesus as he tells us, received of him all that he delivered in relation to this Subject. As to the proper Signification of the Words afore-mentioned, the general Signification of them is much the same, although the special may be somewhat different, to make use of the Language of the Schools; for *Εὐχαριστία*, as *Mr. Pfaffius* defines it, *p. 360*, is, *Gratiarum actio pro donis acceptis*, a Thanksgiving for Benefits received; and *Εὐλογία*, *Benedictio, qua ad certum determinatumque usum dona sanctificantur*, a Benediction, by which the Gifts are sanctified to a certain and determinate Use.

Mr. Basnage, in his *Ecclesiastical History*, repeats the Wish of *Erasmus*, whose Words are,
 ‘ Il feroit à souhaiter, que les Apôtres eussent
 ‘ laissé par écrit, les prières dont leur Maître
 ‘ se servit pour consacrer le pain & le vin,
 ‘ parce qu’elles serviroient de règle à toute
 ‘ l’Eglise, qui s’égare souvent; mais à lieu de
 ‘ cela ils se sont contentés de nous laisser un
 ‘ recit historique de l’invitation que Jesus
 ‘ Christ leur avoit fait pour les obliger à re-
 ‘ cevoir

‘cevoir ce nouveau Sacrament. Prenés, dit-il, ‘mangés, Ceci est mon corps.’ *Hist. de l’Eglise*, l. 23. c. 6. §. 4. It were to be wished, that the Apostles had left in Writing the Prayers which their Master made use of to consecrate the Bread and the Wine ; because they might serve for a Rule to the Church, which is often at Variance with herself. But instead thereof they have contented themselves to deliver to us an historical Recital of the Invitation which Jesus Christ gave them, to oblige them to receive this new Sacrament. ‘Take (saith he) eat, for this is my Body.’ Since, therefore, no such Prayers are left as a Rule to the Church, it is manifest, that our Lord hath left every Church to her own Liberty, to make choice of such Prayers, and Forms of Benediction, as best may suit her Genius and Circumstances, but with this Restriction, that that Liberty shall be confined to the Words of which the Consecration Prayers consist ; since it is essential to Consecration, that we both repeat the Words which were used in the Institution, and likewise that we do what Christ did *.

So St. *Basil*, in his Book *de Spiritu sancto*, cap. 27. §. 2. p. 351. tells us, Τα τῆς ἐπικλήσεως ῥήματα ἐπὶ τῇ ἀναδείξει τῆ ἁγίας τῆς εὐχαριστίας, καὶ τῆ ποτερίας τῆς εὐλογίας, τίς τῶν ἁγίων ἐγγράφως ἡμῖν καταλείπειν, εἰ δὲ γὰρ τέτοις ἀρχόμεθα, ὧν ὁ Ἀπόστολος, ἢ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὑπεμνήσθη, ἀλλὰ καὶ προλέγομεν, καὶ ἐπιλέγομεν
ἕτερα

* Pfaffius, de Consecrat. vet. Euch. p. 9. 360.

ἑτερα ὡς μεγάλην ἔχουσα πρὸς τὸ μυστήριον τὴν ἰσχὺν ἐκ τῆς ἀγράφου διδασκαλίας παραλαβόντες. Which of the Saints hath left us in Writing the Words of the Invocation in the Consecration of the Bread of the Eucharist, and of the Cup of Blessing. Nor are we satisfied with those Things which the Apostle or the Gospel suggest to us; but we both say before, and repeat after, other Things, as having great Power to perform the Mysteries, which we have received from unwritten Tradition.

But his Opinion is contrary to that of St. *Chrysostom*, *Hom. xxvii. in 1 Cor.* and *Proclus*; the latter we have in *Goar's Notes* upon the Missal of St. *John*. *Chrysostom*, p. 140.

Ὁμαθυμαδὸν εὐρησκόμενοί εἰς προσευχὰς πανημερίους ἐτρέπωτο, καὶ τὴν τῆ δεσποτικῆς σώματος μουσικὴν ἱερουργίαν παραμυθιον εὐρηκότες, διεξοδικώτατα αὐτὴν ἤδον. τὸτο γὰρ καὶ τὸ διδάσκειν πάντων προεργιαιέρον ἤρξαντο, πολλῶ δὲ μάλλον μετ' εὐφροσύνης καὶ πλείσας χαρὰς ἦσαν προσκαρτεροῦντες τῇ ταύτῃ θείᾳ τελείῃ, αἰεὶ τῆ κυριακῆς μεμνημένοι λόγῳ. τὸτο ἔστι τὸ σῶμά μου. καὶ τὸτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. καὶ ὁ τρώγων μου τὴν σάρκα, καὶ πίνων μου τὸ αἷμα, ἐν ἐμοὶ μένει, καὶ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῷ. διὸ καὶ πνεύματι συνίλεριμμένῳ πόλλας εὐχὰς ἐμελπον τὸ θεῖον ἐκλίπαρύντες. ἢ μὲν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴς ἐξ ἰσδαίων καὶ ἰθνην νεοφώτιστος τοῖς τῆς χάριτος ἐθίζουσι, καὶ τὰ πρὸ τῆς χάριτος παράλειπεν διδάσκοντες, σκια τῆς χάριτος ὑπάρχοντα, εὐσεβῶς ἐπαιδαγώγην. διὰ τοιούτων τοίνυν ἔχων, τὴν ἐπιφοίτησιν τῆς ἁγίας πνεύματος προσεδόκων. ὅπως τῇ θείᾳ αὐτῇ παρουσίᾳ τὸν προκείμενον εἰς ἱερουργίαν ἄρτον, καὶ οἶνον ὕδαλι μεμιγμένον, αὐτὸ ἐκεῖνο τὸ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα τῆ σωτηρίας ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀποφάνητε, καὶ ἀναδείξῃ. Being with one Consent assembled together, they applied themselves

themselves to Prayers of the Continuance of whole Days; and finding much Consolation in the mystical Consecration of our Lord's Body, they continually celebrated it with Songs; for that were as much as if they had taught, that they esteemed it more excellent than all other Sacrifices; therefore, with so much the more Chearfulness and extreme Joy they continued in this most perfect, divine Mystery, being always mindful of our Lord's saying, This is my Body; and drink ye this in Remembrance of me; and he who eateth my Flesh, and drinketh my Blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. Therefore, with a contrite Spirit, they sang many Prayers, thereby to obtain the divine Presence of the Holy Ghost; and accustoming those of *Judea*, and of the Gentiles, who were newly baptized, to those Mysteries of Grace, and teaching to leave such Things as should go before Grace, they religiously taught such Things as contained a Shadow of Grace. Therefore, with such Prayers, they expected the Illapse of the Holy Ghost, that with his divine Presence he might shew, and exhibit the Bread and Wine mixed with Water, lying for the sacred Ministry, to be the Body and Blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ.

But none gives a better Account of the Apostolical Manner of Consecration, than one *Theodore*, an ancient Bishop, cited by Mr. *Pfaffius*, *Dissert. de Consec. Vet. Euch.* p. 367.

λέγουσι δὲ, ὅτι ἐπὶ ὑπὲρ οὐρανῶν. And it came to pass;
 that when the Comforter came, and the Apo-
 stles, the Arch-priests spoke in the Name of
 God; and he sat upon them in the Shape of
 fiery Tongues, to teach them all Things that
 were necessary for them to know, and had
 appointed every one of them his Station,
 among that People in whose Dialect he had
 instructed them. They then composed divine
 Prayers, and Consecrations of the Mysteries;
 such as were suitable to the Sufferance of that
 People, and the Times when Crouds stood
 round them, and the Snares laid for them by
 their Persecutors; and in their Prayers and
 Exclamations they equally differed from each
 other; but the same Type of the Tradition of
 the Mysteries was performed in all Things
 alike by them all, and as Jesus Christ our Lord
 delivered it. But after the Apostles, speaking
 divine Things, some of the Holy Fathers, each
 in a Way peculiar to himself, made Prayers,
 Exclamations, and the Way of the perfect
 and absolute Consecration; as *Epiphanius*, emi-
 nent among the Saints, *Basil* the Great, and
 divine *Chrysostom*. But they altogether alike
 drew their Instructions from the Streams of
 the Life-flowing Fountain of the Paraclete,
 which the Church of the Orthodox received,
 as spoken and done by Christ himself: And
 now the divine Liturgy of *Basil* the Great,
 and divine *Chrysostom*, prevail before all; but
 next to that of the former Saints, which some
 say

say is that of *James*, called the Brother of our Lord ; others, of *Peter* the Apostle and President ; and others ascribe it to others.

But *James Goar* affirmed, that the Words of Institution have a physical Effect in the Change of the Elements, but the Prayers a moral. And Cardinal *Bona* highly blames *Nicholas Cabasilas*, Archbishop of *Thessalonica*, for his asserting, chap. 29th of his Exposition of the Liturgy, that the Words of Christ, This is my Body, being only narrative, do not suffice to the Consecration, calling it a *detestable Error of modern Greece*, that the Consecration is not performed by Words pronounced in the Person of Christ by the Priests, but by the Prayer of the Priest afterwards, praying, make this Bread the precious Body of Christ, and that which is in the Cup the precious Blood of thy Christ ; which therefore, he says, renders the Words of Christ ineffectual. Notwithstanding that *Cabasilas* had proved, even from the Canon of the Mass, where, before the Words of Institution, there is a Prayer for God's Blessing upon the Elements, in the following Words ; " Which Oblation do thou, O God, we beseech thee, render in all Respects blessed, approved, reasonable, effectual, and acceptable ; and afterwards, command that these Gifts be carried in the Hands of thy holy Angel to thy supercelestial Altar." That the *Latin* or Western, as well as the *Greek* and Eastern Church, consecrated by Prayers,

as well as the Words of Institution, during the Space of a thousand Years ; for the Words of this last Prayer must signify, that they either pray for a local Translation of them from the Earth and these lower Regions to Heaven, or else that they may receive some honourable Change from a lower to a more exalted State ; to which the Cardinal can only answer, that the *Greeks* in the Council at *Florence* did acknowledge the Consecration to be made by the pronouncing the Words, *This is my Body*. Indeed the *Latins* in that Council did maintain, that the Consecration was performed by pronouncing the Words of Institution ; but the Ministers of God were assisting in the Discharge of their Office, as the Labourers in the Harvest : But the *Greeks* on the contrary, that it was by the Invocation of the Holy Ghost and Prayer ; and the Fathers, who held that it was performed by the Words of Institution, are to be understood in this Sense. The Promise annexed to those Words, when spoken by Christ, as declaring what had been already done by him, when he spoke them ; By the bountiful Will of God sanctify the Elements ; which ought therefore to be repeated, and on the Account of which they are effectual, not as spoken by the Priest with an Intention of consecrating ; but the Minister and Congregation are to pray to God to exert his Power and Grace, in making his Creatures of Bread and Wine become the Body and Blood of Christ in Virtue and Effect.

This

This is the Doctrine of St. *Chrysostom* in his Sermon *de Prodit. Judæ*, where are these Words, * Καὶ νῦν πάρεσι Χριστός, &c. which in the same Place he brings out in an Abstract, and saith, Τὸτό μὲ ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα φησὶν ὁ ἱερεὺς. τὸτο τὸ ῥῆμα τὰ προ-
 κείμενα μεταρρυθμίζει. The Priest saith, This is my Body; this Word, as Dr. *Covel* hath translated it, *new models*, or new disposeth the Gifts, *which is far from Goar's Doctrine of transubstantiating them*; or if the Fathers, who attributed the Consecration to these Words, *This is my Body*, are not of the Number of those, who have already declared for a Consecration by Virtue of Prayer, their Thoughts must be interpreted after the afore-mentioned Manner, or else we must allow, that their Testimonies are not to be relied on; for as *Goar* hath observed, ' Obscuriores nimium à
 ' clarioribus exponendos, & paucos cum plu-
 ' ribus consociandos, vel majorum & doctio-
 ' rum, & longè plurium auctoritatem sequen-
 ' dam: ' The more obscure are to be ex-
 pounded by the more plain, and the smaller to be associated together with the greater Number, or the Authority of the greater and more learned, and much the greater Number to be followed.

But I proceed to the Testimonies. St. *Austin* says, ' Accedit verbum ad elementum, & fit
 ' sacramentum etiam ipsum tanquam visibile
 O 2 ' verbum: '

* See St. Chrysostom's Sermon. de Prodit. Judæ, p. 261.

‘ verbum :’ The Word approacheth to the Element, and it becometh a Sacrament, as even the visible Word itself. Again, ‘ Ante
 ‘ verba consecrationis, panis est ; post Christi
 ‘ verba, non panis, sed corpus Christi.’ In his Sermon *de Corpore Christi*, ‘ Intra catholicam
 ‘ ecclesiam nec majus à bono sacerdote, nil
 ‘ minus à malo conficitur, quia non in merito
 ‘ consecrationis, sed in verbo conficitur Salva-
 ‘ toris :’ In the catholic Church there is nei-
 ther more performed by a good Priest, nor
 less by a bad one, because it consisteth not in
 the Merit of the Consecration, but in the
 Words of our Saviour. Yet these Words of
 St. *Austin* can never be understood so as to
 exclude the Prayers, and the divine Use of
 the Sacrament.

Pope *Eugenius* in *Con. Flor.* ‘ Non puto
 ‘ quod aliquis sit ita parum intelligens, quod
 ‘ credat quod possit confici corpus Christi ali-
 ‘ bi quam verbis Salvatoris nostri : non dico
 ‘ rationibus Ambrosii & Hieronimi, videant
 ‘ consequentiam ; nam alias ante istos doctores
 ‘ non fuisset confectum corpus Christi :’ I be-
 lieve not that any is so void of Understand-
 ing, as to think that the Body of Christ can
 be made any other Way than by the Words
 of our Saviour : I speak not from the Reasons
 of Ambrose and Hieronimus, let them see the
 Consequence ; for before those Doctors the
 Body of Christ was not consecrated otherwise.
 To the same Purpose St. *Austin*, in his Sermon
 on

on the Body and Blood of the Lord ; ‘ Invi-
 ‘ sibilis sacerdos, visibiles creaturas, in substan-
 ‘ tiam corporis & sanguinis sui verbo suo se-
 ‘ creta potestate convertit :’ The invisible Priest
 converts visible Creatures into the Substance
 of his Body and Blood, with his Word, by a
 secret kind of Power.

So Cardinal *Perron*, in his 3d Book, p. 947,
 cites the Words of Pope *Innocent III. de Myst.*
Missæ, Book 4. cap. 6, which are as follow ;
 ‘ Il est croyable, que nostre Seigneur consacra
 ‘ par ces mots, Ceci est mon corps, puisque
 ‘ le prestre le fait, & n’en ose rien affermer :’
 It is creditable, that our Lord consecrated by
 these Words, This is my Body, because the
 Priest doth so, and none dare affirm any thing.

Chemnitius was certainly right in affirming,
 that the Catholicks disputed among themselves,
 with what Words the Eucharist is to be con-
 secrated, as will appear by the following Pas-
 sages cited from Pope *Innocent, de Myst. Missæ*,
 in the Works of Cardinal *Perron*.

For some maintained, ‘ Que Christ con-
 ‘ crant par sa propre vertue, consacra avant la
 ‘ prolation des paroles, & nous voulant laisser
 ‘ la puissance de consacrer, non par nostre
 ‘ propre vertu, mais par la sienne, donna puis
 ‘ après la faculté de consacrer aux paroles ; à
 ‘ moyen de quoy nous ne pouvons consacrer,
 ‘ sinon par la prolation des paroles. Et a cela
 ‘ les induisoit l’ordre de l’histoire de l’evan-
 ‘ gile, qui semble dire que nostre Seigneur
 ‘ benit

‘ benit premierement, *i. e.* qu’ils interpretoi-
 ‘ ent consacrer, & puis rompit, & donna à ses
 ‘ Apôtres, & puis prononca les paroles ; mais
 ‘ que la consecration que les prêtres font du
 ‘ corps de Christ, soit operée par la prolation
 ‘ de ces paroles, Ceci est mon corps.’ Because
 Christ consecrating by his own proper Virtue,
 he consecrated before the Uttering of the
 Words, and was willing to leave us the Power
 to consecrate, not by our own proper Virtue,
 but by his, since he afterwards gave the Fa-
 culty of consecrating to the Words ; where-
 fore, that we cannot consecrate but by the
 Uttering these Words ; and from thence the
 Order of the History of the Gospel induced
 these, which seem to say, that our Saviour
 blessed first, that is, which they interpret to
 consecrate ; and that afterwards he brake, and
 gave to his Apostles, and after that he pro-
 nounced these Words ; but that the Consecra-
 tion which the Priests make of the Body of
 Christ, operates by the pronouncing these
 Words, *This is my Body.*

And a little after he blames his Adversary
 for asserting, That our Lord consecrated with
 the Words *Benedixit* and *Gratias egit* ; where-
 as he saith, these are the Words of the Evan-
 gelist, and not of our Lord, meaning that he
 consecrated with the sole Beck of his Omni-
 potent Will. This Opinion was ascribed not
 only to Pope *Innocent III.* but to *Gabriel, Bie-*
lius, Godfrey of Poitiers, and others.

Cardinal

Cardinal *Bellarmin* himself confesseth, that the Divines of the Catholic Church did differ in their Opinions concerning the Consecration of the Cup, and by what Words it was performed, *Lib. 4. de Euch. c. 12.* Though he hath not assigned the Reason of it.

Might I be allowed, I would with the Poet, speaking of the Apostles, assign this as the true one, That this Doctrine of the Church of Rome, that it is performed by the Words of Institution, and that the Elements are transubstantiated, and most of their Doctrines in which they have departed from the Orthodox Faith, were broached rather to increase the Wealth and Power of the Pope and the Romish Clergy, than for the Sake of Truth; though some of them, for they are not all agreed in this Doctrine, may be very sincere.

————— in their room, as they forewarn,
Wolves shall succeed for Teachers, grievous Wolves!
Who all the sacred Mysteries of Heav'n
To their own vile Advantages shall turn,
Of Lucre and Ambition; and the Truth
With Superstitions and Traditions taint,
Left only in those written Records pure,
Though not but by the Spirit understood.
Then shall they seek t' avail themselves of Pains,
Places, and Titles, and with these to join
Secular Power; though feigning still to act
By Spiritual.

MILT. Par. Lost, b. xii. l. 507.

But

But to return to Cardinal *Perron*, who hath likewise given us an Account of the many Opinions which were maintained by the Doctors of the *Roman* Communion upon this Article, though he hath not mentioned them all; his Words are, ‘Aucuns ayants estimé
 ‘ que nostre Seigneur dit deux fois les paroles;
 ‘ la premiere, secretement, pour consacrer, &
 ‘ la seconde, intelligiblement, pour nous mon-
 ‘ strer comme nous devons consacrer. Autres
 ‘ ayants estimé qu’il ne les prononça qu’un fois,
 ‘ mais qu’il ne consacra pas, c’est-à-dire, ne
 ‘ convertit pas le pain en son corps, lorsqu’il
 ‘ le benit. Autres ayants pensé qu’il convertit
 ‘ le pain en son corps par une divine vertu
 ‘ sans aucunes paroles; mais que puis après il
 ‘ donna aux Apostres la forme, & aux paroles
 ‘ la vertu de consacrer, c’est-à-dire, de con-
 ‘ vertir le pain en son corps. Et autres ayants
 ‘ creu qu’il fait en tout & par tout pour le
 ‘ regard de la consecration, comme fait l’église.’
 One having believed, that our Saviour said twice the Words; the first time, secretly, to consecrate; the second, intelligibly, to shew us how we ought to consecrate. Others having believed, that he pronounced not but once, but that he consecrated not, that is to say, that he converted not the Bread into his Body at that time when he blessed it. Others having thought, that he converted the Bread into his Body by a divine Virtue without any Words, but that afterwards he gave to his Apostles the
 Form,

Form, and to the Words the Virtue to consecrate, that is to say, to convert the Bread into his Body. And others having believed, that every Thing, and in all Respects, with regard to the Consecration, is done as the Church doth.

Scotus calls it a lawful Ignorance not to know precisely what Words are requisite for the Form of Consecration, because neither Christ nor the Church hath expressed it, *i. e.* as Cardinal *Perron* interprets his Meaning, he allows the Words of Institution necessary, but that there must be some others used, in order to do what Christ did; and indeed without those others, the Recital of the Words would be but a mere historical Narration; and to know precisely what those others are, was, as *Scotus* said, a lawful Ignorance.

And *p.* 951. ' Et pour tant quand *Scotus*
' dit, qu'il ne sçait si il suffit que le prestre ait
' intention de prononcer ces paroles, Ceci est
' mon corps, en la person d'une autre, & non
' en la sienne, sans qu'il soit besoin que cela
' apparaisse par la relation aux paroles precedentes; il est evident, que pour cela il ne
' veut rien infirmer de la verité de cette doctrine, que toute la forme essentielle de la consecration du corps consiste en ces quatre
' mots, Ceci est mon corps; mais bien montrét il de douter sur le faict de consecration
' du sang, non quelles sont les paroles qui
' seuls font la consecration du sang; d'autant
P ' que

' que les evangelistes ne convenant pas au
 ' repport precis de la forme de la consecration
 ' du sang, & que la forme dont use l'eglise n'est
 ' repportée précisément en tous ses termes par
 ' aucuns des evangelistes, ny n'est précisément
 ' conforme en tous ses termes à la forme dont
 ' usent les Grecs, lesquels neantmoins ne lais-
 ' sent pas de consacrer le corps & le sang; au
 ' moyen de quoy il pretend que ces mots,
 ' Cestui-cy est le calice de mon sang, qui sont
 ' contenus au expressement ou equipollnement
 ' dans tous les formes, tant repportées par
 ' les evangelistes, qui observées par l'eglise
 ' Latine & Grecque, sont necessairement &
 ' essentiaellment de la forme de la consecra-
 ' tion. Mais si ceux-là seuls contiennent pre-
 ' cisement la forme essentielle de la conse-
 ' cration, ou si quelques autres de ceux qui
 ' sont enclosées dans le forme dont se sert
 ' l'eglise, sont necessaires pour la forme essen-
 ' tielle & de la necessité absolue de la conse-
 ' cration du sang.' And whereas * *Scotus* saith,
 he doth not know, that it should suffice, *i. e.*
 to the Consecration, that the Priest hath an
 Intention to pronounce these Words, *This is*
my Body, in the Person of another, and not
 in his own, otherwise than as it must appear
 by the Relation to the preceding Words; it is
 evident;

* According to the expresse Determination of the Coun-
 cil of *Trent*, the Transubstantiation or Change depends
 on such an Intention of the Priest. *Tillotson*, Sermon. xxvi.
 p. 277.

evident, that for that Reason he would affirm nothing concerning the Truth of that Doctrine, that the whole essential Form of the Consecration of the Body consists in these four Words, This is my Body; but he very well shews, that he doubts concerning the Fact of the Consecration of the Blood, to wit, not what are the Words which only make the Consecration of the Blood; and so much the more, because the Evangelists do not equally agree in the precise Report of the Consecration of the Blood, and the Form which the Church makes use of is not precisely reported in all its Terms by any of the Evangelists; nor is it precisely conformable in all its Terms to the Form which the *Greeks* make use of, who nevertheless do not cease to consecrate the Body and the Blood; to whose Assistance they pretend, or to the Assistance of which they pretend, that these Words, This is the Cup of my Blood, (which are contained either expressly, or by Words to the same Purpose, in all the Forms, both reported by the Evangelists, and observed by the *Latin* and *Greek* Churches) are necessary and essential to the Form of the Consecration of the Blood. But if they only contain precisely the essential Form of the Consecration, or if any others of those which are inclosed in the Form which the Church makes use of, are necessary for the essential Form, and of absolute Necessity for the Consecration of the Blood.

But Mr. *Thorndike* hath long since confuted any such Surmise, that the Priest consecrating the Elements takes upon him the Person of Christ, and that therefore very Christ is therein offered, in the following Words: But I will not therefore grant, that this sacrificing (that is, this consecrating the Elements into the Sacrifice) is an Action done in the Person of Christ; nor do I take upon me his Person, whose Words I recite: And I have shewed, that the Consecration is by the Prayers of the Church immediately, though these Prayers are made in Virtue of Christ's Order. *Thorndike's* Epil. p. 45. *Tillotson*, Serm. xxvi. p. 270. 277.

Albertinus in summing up the Judgment of the Fathers upon this Controversy, says, B. i. ch. 7. That they ascribed the Consecration to three Things.

First, To the Virtue of Christ and the Holy Spirit.

2dly, To the Prayers, Blessings and Thanksgivings of the Priest, with the whole Church.

3dly, To the Recital of the Words of Institution.

To the first, as to the properly efficient, and principal Cause; to the second, as to the Condition commanded and prevailing, and the Cause instrumentally operating; to the third, as promissory Words, as they were first spoken by our Lord, and declarative.

There

There were in use among the Apostles and primitive Christians, accessory Kinds of Consecration ; as first by Hymns and Doxologies, and Psalms, which we may learn from * ancient Writers, and the † Holy Scriptures, to have been used from its first Institution at the Celebration of it : That in our Liturgy is from *Luke ii. 14. Glory to God in the highest, and on Earth Peace, Good-will towards Men ;* which, as well as the other Rites observed therein, were derived from the Custom of the *Jews*, of singing their Paschal Hymn. It was divided into two Parts ;

The first contained the *cxiiith* and *cxivth* *Psalms*, and was sung before Supper.

The second the *cxvth*, and three following, *viz. cxvith, cxviith and cxviiith*, and was sung after the drinking the fourth and last Cup.

And these, or such as these, were sung in the primitive Church at the Celebration of the Lord's Supper ; of which the Apostolical Constitutions and the primitive Fathers make frequent mention. In the former it is said, *lib. viii. §. 13. Ψαλμὸς δὲ λεγέσθω τριακὸς δὲ τρίτος ἐν τῷ μεταλαμβάνειν πάντες τὰς λοιπὰς. Let the xxxiii^d Psalm be read while the others are all receiving.* And *St. Chrysostom* speaking upon this Subject, *Oper. t. vi. p. 94,* says, *Μόνον ὕμνον μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς φρίκης, τὸ μυσικὸν ἐκεῖνο τῷ ἁγιασμῷ ἀναφέρεισι μέλος.*

With

* Apostolical Constitutions, b. viii. §. 13. Chryf. Op. t. vi. p. 4.

† Matt. xxvi. 30. Mark xiv. 26.

With much Roaring they sing their mystical Song of Consecration, being only an Hymn. And from thence it has been thought, that the Hymns mentioned *Matt. xxvi. 30.* and *Mark xiv. 26.* did belong to the very Act by which the Eucharist was celebrated, though others have disagreed to this.

A learned Author affirms, that this Hymn was Part of that Discourse of our Saviour in the *xviith* Chapter of *St. John*, where *Jesus* said, * *Father, the Hour is come*, that is, the set Time appointed for my Sufferings and Death, thereby to make way for my Glory ;
Glorify

* *Milton* supposeth the Father glorifying his Son before the Sin of the fallen Angels, and setting him over all Principalities and Powers before the Creation.

*Hear, all ye Angels, Progeny of Light,
 Thrones, Dominations, Princedoms, Virtues, Powers!
 Hear my Decree, which unrevok'd shall stand:
 This Day have I begot, whom I declare
 My only Son ; and on this holy Hill
 Have him anointed, whom ye now behold
 At my Right-hand : Your Head I him appoint,
 And by myself have sworn, to him shall bow
 All Knees in Heav'n, and shall confess him Lord.*

Par. Lost, b. v. l. 600.

Which Lines are an elegant Paraphrase on *Psalms iiii* and *cxth*. And *Milton* elsewhere introduces him, as offering himself a willing Sacrifice for the Redemption of Mankind, according to his own Words, *John x. 15. 18.* *I lay down my Life for the Sheep : No Man taketh it from me.*

*Behold me then ! me for him, Life for Life
 I offer ; on me let thine Anger fall ;*

Account

Glorify thy Son, i. e. sustain me in my approaching Agony, manifestly own me to be thy Son; as he did *Matt.* xxvii. 45, 46. 51, 53. Enable me to triumph over mine and my People's Enemies, in my Resurrection, Ascension and Exaltation at thy Right-hand; and let my Kingdom be propagated all the World over, that thy Son also may glorify thee; where he desires his own Glory, in order to his Father's further Glory, by his Obedience unto Death, and thereby consummating the Work of Man's Redemption, which tends so much to the Advancement of thy Justice, Mercy, Wisdom and Holiness. Ver. 4. *I have glorified thee on the Earth*, done all that belonged to me, both in my Words and Works, to promote thy Honour: *I have finished*, i. e. I am about now speedily to finish the Work of our Reconciliation and Redemption, which thou gavest me to do. See *Pfaffius de Consecr. vet. Euch.* p. 409, 410.

Who added the latter Part of this Hymn, *We praise thee*, &c. is very uncertain. Some have ascribed the Addition to the Apostles, because it is found intire in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, lib. vii. c. 47, 48. where, after the Words,

*Account me Man: I for his Sake will leave
Thy Bosom, and this Glory, next to thee,
Freely put off, and for him lastly die
Well pleas'd; on me let Death wreak all his Rage.*

Words, * Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις Θεῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκία, Glory to God in the highest, and on Earth Peace, Good-will towards Men. Immediately follow the Words, Ἀινῶμεν σε, We praise thee; Ὑμνῶμεν σε, We sing Hymns to thee; Δοξολογῶμεν σε, We glorify thee; Προσκυνῶμεν σε, We worship thee.

But as these Constitutions were not, as pretended to be, compiled or collected by St. *Clement*, at the Command of the Apostles, but written by some private Person † before the Council of *Nice*, no certain Authority can thence be derived. Others ascribe it to Pope *Gelasphoras*, who lived 150 Years after Christ. But the Author of the Pontifical Book, in his Life of that Pope, does not mention him as such. Others call *Symachus* the Author of it, who flourished A. D. 50. Others ascribe it to *Hilary*, Bishop of *Poictiers*; and St. *Athanasius*, who was Cotemporary with *Hilary*, in the

* Elsewhere he has taken notice of this Hymn of Angels, and looks upon it as a Proof of the Divinity of Christ.

— — — — — by a Choir
Of Squadron'd Angels, hear his Carol sung.
A Virgin is his Mother, but his Sire
The Pow'r of the most High! He shall ascend
The Throne hereditary, and bound his Reign
With Earth's wide Bounds, his Glory with the Heavens.
 B. ii. l. 366.

† Brett's Dissertation concerning the Pri. Litur. p. 29. Spurious and interpolated Pieces of the third, fourth and fifth Centuries. See Dr. *Waterland's* Importance of the Doctrine of the Trinity, p. 258.

the latter End of his Book *de Virginitate*, calls it, Προσευχὴν ἑωθινήν, The Morning Prayer; for in the Greek Church it was constantly a Part of their Devotions, and is called, Ἑωθινὸς ὕμνος, The Morning Hymn, and Μεγάλη δοξολογία, The great Doxology, in Distinction to the other smaller, Δόξα πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ, καὶ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι καὶ νῦν, Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost.

A learned Author, in his Defence of the Epistles of St. *Ignatius* *, observes, that those Hymns which Christians used to sing at the Celebration of the Supper of the Lord, were as Proofs of the Divinity and eternal Generation of Christ against the Heresies of the *Ebionites* and *Cerinthians*, in the Times of that Bishop and Martyr, as appears by the following Passage from *Eusebius*; by which it is plain, that they were esteemed so by Christians, *lib. v. c. 28.* Ψαλμοὶ δὲ ὅσοι, καὶ ὠδαὶ ἀδελφῶν ἀπαρχῆς, ὑπὸ πιστῶν γραφεῖσθαι τὸν λόγον τῷ Θεῷ τὸν Χριστὸν ὑμνεῖσι θεολογῶντες, The sacred Psalms and Odes written by the faithful Brethren from the Beginning, celebrate the Divinity of Christ the Son of God †. And mentions several Doxologies and Hymns interspersed in those Epistles, in which the Divinity of Christ is manifestly acknowledged; as *Epist. ad Smyrn.* Δοξάζω Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν Θεόν, I glorify God Jesus Christ.

* Bishop Pearson.

† Importance of the Doctrine of the Trinity, p. 458.

Christ. *Ad Polycarp.* Ἐν Θεῷ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, In our God Jesus Christ. *Ad Ephes. cap. xviii.* Ὁ γὰρ Θεὸς ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐκυφορήθη ὑπὸ Μαρίας, For Jesus Christ our God was conceived of Mary. *Ad Rom.* Κατὰ πίσιν καὶ ἀγάπην τῷ Χριστῷ τῷ Θεῷ ἡμῶν, According to the Faith and Love of Christ our God.

And accordingly he observes, from a Passage in *Pliny*, that these Hymns and Doxologies were objected against the Christians, by the Hereticks, as a very great Crime; the Words are, ‘*Plinio referente affirmabant hanc fuisse summam vel culpæ suæ vel erroris, quod essent soliti, stato die, ante lucem convenire, carmenque Christo quasi Deo canere.*’ According to the Relation of *Pliny*, they affirmed this to have been the chief Fault or Error of which they were guilty, that they were used, on a certain Day, to assemble together before Light, and to sing an Hymn to Christ as God.

And *Photius* objects against *Clemens* of Rome, Ὅτι ἀρχιερεὶα καὶ προσάτην τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐξ ονομάζων, ἔδε τὰς θεοπρεπεῖς καὶ ὑψηλοτέρας ἀφῆκε περὶ αὐτῷ φωνᾶς, That naming Jesus Christ our Lord as our High Priest and Ruler, he did not make such excellent Hymns upon him, as became his Divinity. And arguing in Proof of the Genuineness of the second Epistle of St. *Clement*, which is less generally received, he says, that, Ἐν ἀρχῇ Χριστὸν τὸν Θεὸν κηρύσσει, In the

the Beginning of it it celebrates Christ as God.

The Angelical Hymn was established in Imitation of Christ, his Apostles, and the primitive Christians, in the fourth Council of *Toledo*, to be used in the Church Service: In the present *Roman Missal* it stands in the Beginning of the Communion Office; but is now more conveniently placed in the End of our Communion Service. And thence we learn, that God the Father is the (*John xvii. 3.*) only true God, in Opposition to Idols; but not secluding the other Persons of the Trinity, nor by Way of Excellence and Prerogative, because they have all of them the same Essence, and so every one of them is the only true God; and that when we worship Christ as such, we pay no other Honour to him than what is due to him, according to the Words of the *iiid* and *cxth Psalms*, whereof the former was fulfilled in *David* in a loose Manner, but did more excellently belong to the Messiah; as even *David Kimchi*, that great Enemy of the Christians, acknowledgeth: But the latter cannot be explained of any other than the Messiah; for what the modern *Jews* devise, some concerning *Abraham*, others of *David*, others of *Ezechiab*, are frivolous. The *cxth Psalm* is a *Psalm* of *David*, as the *Hebrew Inscription*, לדוד מומר, teacheth; what therefore *David* says, was said to his Lord; that

can neither be suited to *David* himself, nor to *Hezekiah*, who was of the Posterity of *David*, in no Title more excellent than *David*, *Abraham* had not an excellent Priesthood, and *Melchisedech* blessed him, (*Gen. xiv. 19.*) as inferior to himself. But this, and what is added concerning the Sceptre's coming out of Sion, (*ver. 2.*) and extending itself to the uttermost Borders of the Earth, evidently holds good in the Messiah, which parallel Places, doubtless, such as treat of the Messiah, evidently declare. Nor did the ancient *Hebrews* and Paraphrasts understand it otherwise; the Words are as follow, *Psalms* ii. and cx.

Pf. ii. 6, 7. ואני נסכתי מלכי על-ציון הר-קדש
אספרה אל-חזק יהוה אמר אלי בני אתה אני היום
ולדתיך :

Pf. cx. 1, 2. לדיד מזמור
נאם יהוה לאדני שב לימיני עד-אשית איבך הרם
לרגליך :

מטה עזך ישלח יהוה מציון רדה בקרב איבך :

Pf. ii. 6. Yet have I set my King upon my holy Hill of Zion.

But that it is properly *Jesus* of *Nazareth* in whom these Things are fulfilled, I do believe upon the sole Affirmation of his Disciples, by Reason of their great Probity, as the *Jews* believe *Moses* concerning those Things which, without any other Witness, he said was delivered to him of God. But there are, besides these, very many and most strong Arguments of

of that extraordinary Power and Godhead, which *Jesus* was endowed with: He was seen of many after he was restored to Life; he was seen carried into Heaven; as likewise Devils were cast out; Diseases were healed by his Name only; and the Gift of Tongues given to his Disciples, which *Jesus* himself promised as Signs of his Kingdom. Add to this, that it appears by the Words of the *cxxxv Psalm*, ver. 12. that his Scepter, that is, the Word of the Gospel, came out of Sion, by no human Power, by the divine Power only, to the uttermost Borders of the Earth, and subdued People and Kings to itself, as the *Psalms* foretold.

The *Jewish* Cabalists hold a certain middle Person, the Son of *Enoch*, between God and Men, endowed with no Sign of such great Power; how much more should we credit him, who hath given us so great Proofs of himself; nor doth our so doing tend to the lessening God the Father, from whom, as from the Head and Fountain of the Deity, this Power is communicated to *Jesus*, and to whom it will return, when the Son shall have delivered up his mediatorial Kingdom into the Hands of the Father, and God shall be all in all. See *John* xiv. 13.

II. By the Lord's Prayer.

Marcus Gregorius and *Amularius* asserted, that the Apostles used it only, or alone, to consecrate

secrate the Eucharist; the Words of the former are as follow, *Ep.* 64. *lib.* 7. ‘ Quia mos
 ‘ Apostolorum fuit ut ad ipsam solummodo
 ‘ orationem oblationis hostiam consecrarent :’
 Because it was the Custom of the Apostles to
 consecrate the Oblation of the Host only with
 the Lord’s Prayer. But as there is no positive
 Command in Scripture for any such Use in
 particular to be made of that Prayer; and as
 there is no Notice taken by the Fathers of the
 first Century, that it was applied to any such
 Use; and as in the ancient Liturgy in the
 Apostolical Constitutions, there is not a Word
 of it, it is probable that they received this
 Account from ancient Tradition, the Occasion
 of which might have arisen from a Practice
 among the ancient Christians (as Archbishop
Wake hath told us in his Sermon on the Sa-
 crament) of their receiving the Sacrament
 every Day. So that, as the Christian Fathers
 interpreted the Words, Τὸν ἄρτον ἐπὶ ἕσσιον δὸς ἡμῖν
 σήμερον, Give us this Day our super-substantial
 Bread of the Eucharistical Food; others inter-
 preted it of Christ, the Bread of Life; in par-
 ticular *Tertullian*, *de Oratione*, ‘ Spiritualiter
 ‘ intelligamus, Christus enim panis noster est,
 ‘ quia vita Christus & vitæ panis :’ We may
 understand it spiritually; for Christ is our
 Bread, because Christ is Life, and the Bread
 of Life. Therefore *St. Cyril*, in his fifth my-
 stagogical Catechism, interprets, ἄρτον ἐπιέσιον,
 by τοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν ἕσσαν ψυχῆς τρεπόμενον, What is con-
 verted

verted into the Substance of the Soul. Hence St. *Cyprian* says, in his Book *de Oratione*, This Bread we desire daily to be given us, lest that we who are in Christ, and receive the Eucharist daily for the Food of our Salvation, by the intervening of some grievous Fault, while hindered, and not communicating, are prohibited from the celestial Bread, should be separated from the Body of Christ. And Cardinal *Bona*, in his Book *de divina Psalmodia*, lib. xvi. §. 1. p. 11. observes, with some Reason, tho' it must be allowed what is not sufficient to prove the Point, That in the first Ages of the Church it was customary to repeat the Lord's Prayer three several Ways in the Eucharistical Service, to wit, in the Beginning, Middle, and End.

1st, With a very low and still Voice.

2dly, With a loud and clear Voice.

3dly, With a Voice partly loud and partly still.

And in his second Book, *Rer. Liturg. c. 15.* he observes, That the Initiated only were permitted to repeat this Prayer.

The best Authors, both ancient and modern, allow, that it is not so much used as tending to any Consecration or Sanctification of the Elements, as to sanctify and qualify us for the worthy Participation and Reception of them; this the Manner in which it is placed in all the Liturgies of the Christian Church, except the *Clementine*, sufficiently discovers,

i. e.

7. e. after the general Intercession for all Estates and Conditions of Men, and after the Conclusion of the Petition for the Descent of the Holy Ghost.

III. The Council of *Cressia*, A. D. 838. says, that the Consecration is made by Prayers and the Sign of the Cross.

IV. It was likewise performed by dipping the consecrated Bread into the Wine; from hence, in the Liturgy of St. *James*, when the consecrated Bread is put into the Cup, the Priest says, "Ενωσις τῷ παναγίῳ σώματος καὶ τῷ τιμίῳ αἵματος τῷ Κυρίῳ καὶ Θεῷ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ. The Union of the most holy Body and precious Blood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Then the Priest signs the Left-hand Piece, and after that the other half, and immediately begins to break, and to distribute a Part into each Cup, saying, The Union is made, sanctified, and compleated, in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, now and ever. And when he signs the Bread he says, "Behold the Lamb of God, the Son of the Father, that takes away the Sins of the World, and was sanctified for the Life and Salvation of the World." And when he distributes a Piece into each Cup, he says, "This is the Portion of Christ's holy Body, full of Grace and Truth, of the Father, and the Holy Ghost, to whom be Honour and Power for ever and ever."

Upon

Upon which Dr. *Brett* observes, §. 28. p. 279. of his Dissertation upon the Liturgies, that this is an ancient Addition, and seems to have been older in the Church, than the Councils of *Ephesus* and *Chalcedon*, that is, than the fifth Century, because we find it both in the *Nestorian* and *Monophysite* Liturgies: Now *Nestorius* was condemned, and he and his Adherents excluded the Communion of the catholic Church in the Year 431. Therefore, after that Time we have reason to believe, that they would not receive any new Customs from the catholic Church, nor the catholic Church from them.

V. Another Kind of Consecration was by pouring warm Water into the Cup, signifying thereby the Descent of the holy Spirit. But it is to be noted, that the warm Water is to be poured in after the Consecration, at which Action the Priest blessed, saying, *Ευλογημένη ἡ ζήσις τῶν ἁγίων σε, παντοτε νῦν καὶ αἰεὶ εἰς τῆς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, ἀμήν*, Blessed be the fervent Zeal of thy Saints, now, henceforth, and for ever more, Amen. But this I do not find mentioned in any of the ancient Liturgies, but that of St. *Chrysostom* and St. *Basil*, and the Reason of it was, as some explain it, to fulfil the Type of Christ, out of whose Side issued warm Water.

I shall now proceed to the Testimonies of some other Fathers and Liturgies likewise concerning the Manner of Consecration.

We have seen the Opinion of *Proclus* concerning the Tradition of the divine Liturgy, who says, Δια τοιούτων τοίνυν ἐυχῶν τὴν ἐπιφάντησιν τῆς ἁγίας πνεύματος προσεδόκων ὅπως τῇ Θεῷ αὐτῇ παρυσία τὸν προκείμενον εἰς ἱερουργίαν ἄρτον καὶ οἶνον ὕδατι μεμιγμένον αὐτὸ ἐκεῖνο το σῶμα καὶ αἷμα τῆ σοτήρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀποφάνη τε καὶ ἀναδείξη. With such Prayers they expected the Illapse of the holy Spirit, that by his divine Presence he may shew and exhibit the Bread and the Wine mixed with Water, lying for the sacred Consecration, to be the very Body and Blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ.

Marcus Ephesus, who directly contradicts the aforesaid *John Phurnes*; his Words are as follow: Ὅτι οὐ μόνον ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν δεσποτικῶν ῥημάτων ἁγιάζονται τὰ Θεῷ δῶρα, ἀλλ' ἐκτὴς μετὰ ταῦτα ἐυχῆς καὶ εὐλογίας τῆς ἱερέως, δυνάμει τῆς ἁγίας πνεύματος. For the divine Gifts are sanctified, not only by our Lord's Words, but by the Prayers which follow them, and the Benediction of the Priest, by the Power of the Holy Ghost.

The Bishop of *Sarum* *, in his Exposition upon the twenty-eighth Article of the Church, writes with great Truth thus: ' It cannot be denied, but that in the most early Ages *Justin* and *Irenæus* did believe such a Sanctification of the sacred Elements, whereby a certain divine Virtue was in them: And all the ancient Fathers do determine, that by

* See *Burnet* on the thirty-nine Articles, p. 334.

‘ the Means of the sacerdotal Consecration, all
 ‘ that divine Grace, Spirit, and Virtue, which
 ‘ is inherent in the Body and Blood of the
 ‘ Lord, is sent down from Heaven upon the
 ‘ Bread and Wine ; and that thereupon they
 ‘ are called, and are the Body and Blood of
 ‘ Christ, as St. *John* was called, and was in
 ‘ Power and Spirit *Elias*.’ And hence *Irenæus*
 affirmed, that our Flesh was nourished by
 them on that Account.

Nicephorus, Patriarch of *Constantinople*, writes
 to the same Purpose : “Ὡςπερ ὁ ἄρτος καὶ ὁ οἶνος καὶ
 τὸ ὕδωρ φυσικῶς εἰς σῶμα καὶ αἷμα τῷ ἐσθίουτος καὶ πίνοντος
 μεταβάλλεται καὶ ἐκ αὐτῶν ἐν ποίμην ἕτερον σῶμα γίνεσθαι παρὰ
 τὸ πρότερον, ἔτι καὶ ταῦτα ὑπερφῶς ἐπικλήσει τῷ ἱερεύ-
 οντος, ἐπιφοιτήσει τε τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματος εἰς σῶμα καὶ αἷμα
 τῷ Χριστῷ μεταβάλλεται. As the Bread and the
 Wine, and the Water, are naturally changed
 into the Body and the Blood of whosoever eat-
 eth and drinketh ; and we cannot say, that
 the Body is other than what it was before, so
 those Things supernaturally, by the Invocation
 of the Priest, and the coming on of the Holy
 Ghost, are changed into the Body and Blood
 of Christ.

Tertullian, A. D. 92. in his Book *de Orat.*
c. 14. says ; ‘ Similiter, & stationum diebus,
 ‘ non putant plerique sacrificiorum orationibus
 ‘ interveniendum, quod statio solvenda sit, ac-
 ‘ cepto corpore Domini : ergo devotum Deo
 ‘ obsequium eucharistia resolvit ? an magis
 R 2 ‘ obligat ?

‘ obligat? nonne solenior erit statio tua, si ad
 ‘ aram Dei steteris? Accepto corpore Do-
 ‘ mini, & reservato, utrumque saluum est, &
 ‘ participatio sacrificii & executio officii.’ On
 the stationary, *i. e.* fasting Days, many think,
 that they ought not to be present at the Prayers
 of the Sacrifices, lest their Fast should be bro-
 ken by eating the Body of the Lord; Does
 therefore the Eucharist slacken our Devotions
 to God? Will not your Station be more so-
 lemn, if you attend at God’s Altar? By taking
 the Body of our Lord, and reserving it till
 your Fast is done, *i. e.* to be eaten, both will
 be secured, to wit, the Partaking of the Sacri-
 fice and the Performance of your Duty.

Origen, contra Cels. A. D. 230. Κέλσος μὲν ὡς
 ἀγνοῶν Θεὸν τὰ χαριστήρια Δαίμοσιν ἀποδίδω, ἡμεῖς δὲ
 τῷ τῷ παντὸς δημιουργῷ εὐχαριστῶντες, καὶ τὰς μετ’ εὐχαριστίας
 καὶ εὐχῆς τῆς ἐπὶ τοῖς δοθεῖσι προταγομένης ἅρτας ἐσθίσμεν,
 σῶμα γενομένης, διὰ τὴν εὐχὴν, ἀγιάτι. Let *Celsus*, as
 one that knows not God, offer his eucharisti-
 cal Sacrifices to Dæmons, but we, appeasing
 the Creator of all Things, eat Loaves, laid
 down with Thanksgiving and Prayer, offered
 for his Gifts, they being made a certain holy
 Body by the Means of Prayer.

The Words of the *Clementine Liturgy*,
Apost. Const. Book viii. c. 12. are as follow:
 Προσφέρωμέν σοι τῷ Βασιλεῖ, We offer to thee our
 King*.

* *Brett’s Translation, p. 9.*

The Liturgy of St. *James* runs thus: Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς ὁ Θεὸς κατὰ τὸ μέγα ἔλεός σε καὶ ἐξαπόγειλον ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα δῶρα ταῦτα τὸ πνεῦμά σε τὸ παν- ἅγιον, τὸ κύριον καὶ ζωοποιόν, τὸ σύνθρονον σοὶ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ πατρί, καὶ τῷ μονογενεῖ σε υἱῷ, &c. Ἀυτὸ τὸ πνεῦμά σε τὸ πάναγιον κατὰπεμψον, δέσποτα, ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ προ- κείμενα ἅγια δῶρα ταῦτα, ἵνα ἐπιφοιτῇσαν τῇ ἀγία καὶ ἀγαθῇ καὶ ἐνδόξῳ αὐτῇ παρυσία ἀγιάσῃ καὶ ποιήσῃ τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τῆτον σῶμα ἅγιον τῷ Χριστῷ σε, καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τῆτο αἷμα τίμιον τῷ Χριστῷ σε, &c. *Pfaffius*, p. 379.

Have Mercy upon us, O God, according to thy great Mercy, and send upon us, and upon these Gifts here present, thy most holy Spirit, the Lord and Life-giver, Assessor in the Throne with thee, O God the Father, and thy only Son, &c. Send down, O Lord, that same, thy most holy Spirit, upon us, and upon these holy Gifts lying before us, that by light- ing upon them with his sacred, good, and glorious Presence, he may sanctify and make this Bread the sacred Body of thy Christ, and this Cup the venerable Blood of thy Christ.

That of St. *Basil* runs thus, according to *James Goar*, in his *Euchologium*, and which is used, upon some great Festivals, throughout the Patriarchate of *Constantinople*: "We ap- proach to thine holy Altar, and laying before thee these Symbols of the holy Body and Blood of thy Christ, we pray and beseech thee, O thou Holy of Holies, of thy gracious Goodness, that thine holy Spirit may come upon us, and upon these Gifts, to bless, to sanctify,

sanctify, and to perfect them; make this Bread the precious Body of our Lord and God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ, and this Cup the precious Blood of our Lord, &c." And at a little Distance are the Words, μεταβάλλων τῷ πνεύματι σε τῷ ἁγίῳ, Changing them by thy holy Spirit; or as others read it, μεταβαλὼν, Thou hast changed, &c.

St. Chrysostom's Liturgy is still used in the Church of Constantinople and throughout that Patriarchate; and is agreeable to his Doctrine, both in his Sermon *de Proditione Judæ*, and likewise in his sixth Book *de Sacerdotio*; the Words of it are as follow: "Ετι προσφέρομέν σοι τὴν λογικὴν ταύτην καὶ ἀναίμακτον λατρείαν, καὶ παρακαλῶμεν καὶ δεόμεθα καὶ ἱκετεύομεν, κατὰπεμψον τὸ πνεῦμά σε τὸ ἅγιον ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα δῶρα ταῦτα ποίησον τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τέτον τίμιον σῶμα τῷ Χριστῷ σε τὸ δὲ ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ τέτω τίμιον αἷμα τῷ Χριστῷ σε. We offer unto thee this reasonable and unbloody Service; and we beg, pray, and beseech thee to send down thine holy Spirit upon us, and upon these Gifts here lying before thee; and make this Bread the venerable Body of thy Christ, and that which is in the Cup the venerable Blood of thy Christ. And in some Editions the following Words are added, Μεταβαλὼν τῷ πνεύματί σε τῷ ἁγίῳ, Thou hast changed them with thy Holy Ghost; the same which are in the Liturgy of St. Basil before-mentioned.

Here

Here I shall observe, that from the Words *Ποίησον τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τὸ σῶμα*, Make this Bread the Body, *Leo Alatus* hath concluded, that the Verb *ποιήσου* relates to the succeeding Words, and that we pray therein, that the Elements may become the Body and Blood of Christ, in their salutary Effects : For he says, that by these Words we are not to understand, that the Elements are not yet converted into the sacred Body and Blood of Christ, since that, he says, was done by the Words of Institution ; arguing that the Aorist shews the Change to have been accomplished, *viz. μεταβαλὼν*, thus translating it, For thou hast changed them by thy holy Spirit ; and that at these Words, *make this Bread the Body*, we pray that God would accept the Sacrifice, and that he would command the Sacrament to be salutary to those who receive it.

But from these Places of the Liturgies appears the Error of the Opinion of the *Romish* Church, that the Words of Institution only, without Prayers, consecrate ; for if by them only, which go before the Prayer of Invocation of the Holy Ghost, a Change of the Symbols be made, there seems to be no Need of the Invocation to perform that which is already accomplished : And a new and useless Consecration wants not the Words, Changing them, or thou hast changed them by thy Holy Ghost ; which Difficulty *Leo Alatus* and others have solved in the foregoing Manner, whereby

whereby they manifestly wrest the Words from their proper Signification ; nor doth the Context suffer that we should too much urge the Sense of the Aorist ; for immediately after the Prayer of Invocation for the Descent of the Holy Ghost upon us, and upon the Gifts, and before the Words, μεταβαλὼν τῷ πνεύματί σε τῷ ἁγίῳ.

All after the Words of Institution, God is prayed to, that he would make the Bread and Wine the Body and Blood of Christ ; which supposeth that no Change is yet made in the Elements until the Word μεταβάλλων, changing, is pronounced ; and that it is to be understood therefore in the present Tense, and not μεταβαλὼν, in the Aorist. And that the Words, ποιήσου τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τὸ σῶμα, refer to the preceding Words, *i. e.* the Gifts lying in View ; by which we pray, that God would change them, and that no physical Change hath been made by the Words of Institution.

And that only a moral Change upon the Elements is prayed for by this Invocation, farther appears, because the Holy Ghost was prayed for by the primitive Church, both to sanctify the Gifts and the Receivers ; and in the Consecration of the baptismal Water, and the Chrism, for the Sanctification of them. In the Consecration of the baptismal Water the Priest thus prays ; ‘ Descendat, Domine, ‘ in hanc plenitudinem fontis virtus spiritus ‘ tui, totamque hujus aquæ substantiam, rege-
nerandi

‘nerandi fœcundet effectū.’ Let the Virtue of thy Spirit, O Lord, descend on the Plenitude of this Fountain, and endow the whole Substance of this Water with a Power of regenerating. And in the Consecration of the Chrism, St. *Cyril*, Bishop of *Jerusalem*, hath told us, that the same Word is made use of; Τὸ το μύρον ἐκ ἐτι ψιλόν, ἐδ’ ὡς ἂν εἰποὶ τίς κοῖνον μετ’ ἐπικλήσιν, This holy Ointment is no more bare Ointment, nor to be called common after the Invocation; where no other but a moral Change, as to Uses and Benefits, is supposed.

But *Goar* on the contrary argues, that all the Virtue of producing the Sacrament, is allowed to belong to Christ, as the chief Cause, depending upon none else; yet the *Greeks* are wont, as the Truth requires, to allow equal Share in the Action, to the holy Spirit; 1 *Cor.* xii. 13. Then he proceeds thus, speaking of the Church, ‘In baptizmo, ut aqua, virtute, & operatione & adventu spiritûs sancti sanctificetur; in confirmatione, vel extremâ unctione, ut par beneficium, sacrum chrisma, vel oleum accipiant, preces easque ferventes emittit; commemorat in pœnitentiâ spiritûs sancti donum ad solvenda delicta, gratiam quoque ejusdem in ordine prædicat; cum jam Christi virtutem, verbis ejus manifestam, & illius opus agnitum, supponat, effectum pariter spiritûs sancti expostulat.’ In Baptism, that the Water may be sanctified by the Virtue, and Operation, and Coming of the Holy Ghost;

in Confirmation and extream Unction, that the sacred Chrism, or anointing Oil, may receive a like Benefit, she sends out Prayers, and those very fervent; she commemorates in Penance, the Gift of the Holy Ghost to release Sins, and in Order declares his Grace; when she supposeth, the Virtue of Christ manifest in his Words, and his Work acknowledged, she likewise requires earnestly the Effect of the holy Spirit; but then he supposeth the Virtue of Christ manifest by his Words, and the Work acknowledged, to be done, and the Intent of the Prayer for the Descent of the holy Spirit upon the eucharistical Symbols, to be quite of a different kind, to wit, that they may be changed and transubstantiated. But with how little Reason hath been proved by * an excellent Writer, who has shewn, that the Work of the Holy Ghost is the same which is prayed for upon the eucharistical Elements, with that which is prayed for upon the Water for Baptism, and the Unction for the Sick; which St. Cyril of Jerusalem, A. D. 348. mentions to have been spread over the Forehead of the sick Person; that it was looked upon by him as an exhibitive Symbol of spiritual Grace. And he exhorted his Audience not to regard the outward Symbols, as they are in themselves, but what they are in their appointed Use, and the Graces which they exhibit; whether the
Water

* Dr. *Waterland's* Rev. of the Euch. p. 111, 112.

Water in Baptism, the holy Elements of Bread and Wine in the Eucharist, or the Chrism for spiritual Unction. Hence the latter *Greeks* called the holy Spirit, Τελαρχικόν, καὶ ἁγιαστικόν πνεῦμα, The consecrating and sanctifying Spirit.

He hath the following Passage in relation to the Eucharist: Μὴ πρόσεχε ἔν ὡς ψιλοῖς τῷ ἄρτῳ καὶ τῷ οἴνῳ, σῶμα γὰρ καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ κατὰ δεσποτικὴν τυγχάνει ἀπόφασιν. Ἐι γὰρ καὶ ἡ αἰσθησις σοι τῆτο ὑποβάλλει, ἀλλ' ἡ πίσις σε βεβαιάτω μὴ ἀπὸ τῆς γεύσεως κρίνης τὸ πρᾶγμα, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τῆς πίσεως πληροφορεῖ ἀνεκδιάσως σώματος καὶ αἵματος Χριστοῦ καταξιωθείς. Do not look on the Bread and Wine as bare Elements, for by our Lord's own Declaration they are the Body and Blood of Christ. But if your Sense should suggest that Notion to you, yet let your Faith confirm you, and judge not this Matter from the Taste, but from the Fulness of Faith, undoubtedly thinking them the Body and Blood of Christ.

2dly, For the Water in Baptism: Μὴ ὡς ὕδατι λιτῷ, πρόσεχε τῷ λυτρῷ, ἀλλὰ τῇ μετὰ τῷ ὕδατος δεδομένη χάριτι, Regard not this Washing as pure Water, but the Grace bestowed by Means of the Water.

3dly, For the Chrism: Ἄλλ' ὄρα μὴ ὑπονόησης ἐκεῖνο τὸ μύρον ψιλὸν εἶναι ὅσπερ γὰρ ὁ ἄρτος τῆς εὐχαριστίας, μετὰ τὴν ἐπίκλησιν τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι ἐκ ἑτοῦ ἄρτος λιτοῦ, ἀλλὰ σῶμα Χριστοῦ, ἔτο καὶ τὸ ἅγιον τῆτο μύρον ἐκ ἑτοῦ ψιλοῦ, ἐδ' ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις κοινὸν μετ' ἐπίκλησιν ἀλλὰ Χριστοῦ χάρισμα, καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου, παρουσία τῆς αὐτῆς θεότητος ἐν-

ἐργικὸν γενόμενον· ὕπερ συμβολικῶς ἐπὶ μετώπῃ, καὶ τῶν ἄλ-
 λων σε χρίεται αἰσθητηρίων, καὶ τῷ φαινομένῳ μύρω τὸ σῶμα
 χρίεται· τῷ δὲ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι καὶ ζωοποιῷ ἡ ψυχὴ ἁγιάζεται.
 Have a care of suspecting, that this is mere
 Ointment; for, like as the sacramental Bread,
 after the Invocation of the holy Spirit, is no
 more bare Bread, but the Body of Christ; so
 also this holy Unguent is no more bare Oint-
 ment, nor to be called common, after the
 Invocation; but it is the Gift of Christ, and
 of the holy Spirit, endowed with special
 Energy by the Power of the Godhead; and
 it is symbolically spread over the Forehead,
 and the other sensible Parts of the Body: so
 then the Body is anointed with visible Oint-
 ment, but the Soul is sanctified by the holy
 and enlivening Spirit.

The Answer which *Goar* and others pre-
 tend to have been given in the Name of all
 the *Greeks*, to Pope *Eugenius* IV. in the 25th
 Session of the Council of *Florence*, A. D. 1439
 he hath inserted p. 140. of his *Euchologium*
Græcum; the Words whereof are as follow;
 Whatsoever is held by the holy *Roman* Church,
 in the Article of consecrating the divine Gifts,
 that we hold also; that is, that the divine
 Words of our Lord, Take, eat, this is my Body;
 drink ye all of this, this is my Blood, are those
 which consecrate and perfect the divine Gifts;
 nevertheless, the Ministry of the Priest may
 be compared to the Labour of the Husband-
 man, that the Earth may bring forth Fruit;
 but

but we refer all to the Words of our Lord, in which we perfectly agree with you.

But *Syropulus*, in his History of that Council, *Sect.* i. c. 8. f. 293, 294. says, that *Bessarion* only joined with the *Latins* in this Opinion, the rest of the *Greeks* being ignorant of it, and of a contrary Opinion; that the Emperor and he feign'd a Consent with the *Latins* to appease the Anger of the Pope: Which yet Cardinal *Bona* objected to *Cabasilas* as the Opinion of the whole *Greek Church*. *Sect.* i. c. 1. f. 278. he writes, that the *Latins* requested that the Benediction and Invocation might be erased out of the Liturgies. To this the Emperor answered, that there were in the Eastern Church 2000 Liturgies, which agreed with that of *St. Basil* and *St. Chrysostom* in this particular Prayer.

That much arguing having arisen between the *Greeks* and *Latins*, concerning this Matter, to please the latter, the Bishops of *Nice* and *Russia* proposed a middle Opinion, which pleased neither.

After this Disputation was ended, the Pope is reported grievously to have chid the *Greeks*. When afterwards the Definition of the Synod was subscribed by the *Greeks*, the Emperor sent Delegates to declare the Consent of the *Greek Church* with the *Roman*, that the Mind of the Pope might again be mitigated. Then *Bessarion* is said to have spoken in the Assembly;

bly; * Whatsoever is held by the holy *Roman Church*, &c. Ὅσπερ δοξάζει ἡ ἁγία Ῥωμαϊκὴ ἐκκλησία περὶ, &c.

Then the Historian adds, this the Bishop of *Nice* spoke as the Sentiments of the Community, who knew nothing of the Matter, nor did they give their Consent to any thing which the Bishop had spoken, out of his most subtil Perfidy, to oblige the Emperor and the *Latins*. And that the *Latins* afterwards desiring that this Speech might be inserted in *Ogwo Sinodali*, in the Resolution of the Synod. The Emperor absolutely refused to agree to it; fearing, that when he should return to *Constantinople*, he should give occasion to some People to talk, as if he had abolished the Liturgies of St. *Basil* and St. *Chrysostom*, which they had received from *James* the Brother of our Lord. But lest that the *Latins* should complain, that they had been circumvented by false and deceitful Words, the Emperor commanded that the Bishop of *Nice*, and the Principal of the *Greeks*, should publicly assert all this before the Pope; and that was done, and by the *Latins* inserted without the Knowledge and Consent of the others.

The State of the Controversy, with the Solution of the *Greeks* thereunto applied, very little different from that of *Syropulus*, is the following,

* *Pfaffius's* Dissert. de Consecratione vet. Euch. p. 420.

following, according to *Labee* : * *Περὶ δὲ τῆς*
Θείας ἱερουργίας ἐζητήθη πρὸς τῶν λατίνων· πῶς τῶν τῷ Χριστῷ
ῥημάτων λαλήθεντων τῷ λάβετε, φάγετε, τῷτο γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸ
σῶμα μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κλόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, καὶ
τῷ πείτε ἐξ αὐτῶ πάντες, τῷτο γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸ αἷμά μου τὸ τῆς
καινῆς καὶ αἰωνίης διαθήκης, μυσῆριον πίσεως, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ
πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, καὶ τῶν ἁγίων δώ-
ρων διὰ τῶτων τῶν ῥημάτων τελειωθέντων ὑμεῖς μετὰ ταῦτα
ποιεῖτε ἐυχὴν καὶ λέγετε· καὶ ποιήσουσιν τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τῷτου τί-
μιον σῶμα τῷ Χριστῷ σε, τὸ δὲ ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ τῷτου τίμιον
αἷμα τῷ Χριστῷ σε μεταβαλὼν τῷ πνεύματί σε τῷ ἁγίῳ.
Ἐλύθη καὶ τῷτο ἕτως· ἡμεῖς εἶπομεν, ὅτι ὁμολογοῦμεν διὰ τῶν
ῥημάτων τῶτων τελειῶσθαι τὸν Θεῖον ἄρτον καὶ γίνεσθαι σῶμα
Χριστοῦ, ἀλλ' ὕστερον, καθὼς καὶ αὐτοὶ λέγετε· κέλευσόν προσε-
νεχθῆναι τὰ δῶρα· ταῦτα διὰ χειρὸς ἁγίου ἀγγέλῳ εἰς τὸ
ὑπερεράνιον σε θυσιαστήριον, ἕτω καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐυχόμεθα λέγοντες
κατελθεῖν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ποιῆται ἐν ἡμῖν
τὸν ἄρτον τῷτον τίμιον σῶμα τῷ Χριστῷ σε καὶ τὸ ἐν τῷ ποτη-
ρίῳ τῷτου τίμιον αἷμα τῷ Χριστῷ σε καὶ μεταβαλεῖν αὐτὰ τῷ
πνεύματι αὐτῷ τῷ ἁγίῳ, ὥς γενέσθαι τοῖς μεταλαμβάνουσιν
εἰς νῆψιν ψυχῆς, εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. See *Brett*, p. 148.

Concerning the divine Consecration Inquiry was made, how came it to pass, that the Words of Christ being spoken, Take ye, eat, this is my Body, which is broken for you for the Remission of Sins ; and this, Drink ye all, and what follows ; and the sacred Gifts being thereby consecrated ; you after all make a Prayer, and say, Make this Bread the venerable Body of thy Christ ; but that which is
in

* Cited by *Pfaffius*, *Dissert. de Consec. vet. Euch.* p. 414.

in the Cup the venerable Blood of thy Christ, which thou hast changed with thy holy Spirit, and that was resolved in this Manner. We say along with you, that we confess, that by these Words, is perfectly consecrated the divine Bread, and made the Body of Christ; but afterwards, as you say, command that these Gifts be carried by the Hands of thy holy Angel up to thy celestial Altar; so we likewise pray, saying, Let thy holy Spirit descend upon us, and make that Bread *in us* the venerable Body of thy Christ, and change them by his holy Spirit, that they may be, to those who partake thereof, for the cleansing of the Soul, for the Remission of Sins, that they prove not to our Judgment or Condemnation.

And *p.* 497. he adds, that *Dorotheus*, Bishop of *Mitylene*, and the Bishop of *Russia*, as well as the Bishop of *Nice*, privately answered Pope *Eugenius IV.* to the same Purpose, but that the other *Greeks* agreed not to it. *Pfaff.* *p.* 414, 415. And because they knew not the true Definition concerning the Perfection of the Gifts, thought to omit this Question for the future, which the *Latins* opposed, and desired its last Determination; but it is not clear from the *Acts*, whether it followed or not: But elsewhere he says, this Controversy was not decided in the Canons of the Council.

Goar however puts several Glosses upon the Prayer for the Descent of the Holy Ghost, to make it consistent with the Doctrine of the *Latins*; that the Words of Institution only make the Consecration of this Sacrament: As, first, It is proper for Men who labour under so many Imperfections, not to attempt the Performance of this Duty without Prayer, that God may the better enable them to perform it.

2dly, That altho' the Promise of God to the Words of Christ, be effectual in the Mouth of the Priest, and cannot be disannulled, yet we are nevertheless, and God requires us, to pray for the Performance of it; not, says he, that we may obtain what is promised; for we have full Possession of the Thing promised, upon the Performance of the Duty, the Words of our Lord having been spoke; therefore we are to pray, not for the Thing promised, but that it may be possessed in Peace, and that the Satisfaction arising from the Possession of it may be increased, cherished and confirmed. *Eucholog.* p. 9. 139. here he says the same with Cardinal *Bona, de Reb. Liturg. l. ii. c. 13. p. 180, 184.* which they deliver as the Opinion of the *Greeks* at the Council of *Florence*. *Arcudius* said likewise the same, to wit, that the *Greek* Fathers in the last Session of the Council of *Florence*, being asked by Pope *Eugenius IV.* why they added those Prayers after the Words of Christ, as if the Consecration were not yet perfected?

perfected? answered, that they made no doubt, but the Consecration was made by the Words of Christ; but nevertheless they said these Prayers, that Benefit might accrue to us by that Sacrifice. Divers other learned *Romanists* urge this Declaration of the *Greeks* in that Council; and from thence argue, that even the *Greeks* themselves, who always use these Prayers after the Words of Institution, do not understand them as in any measure contributing to the Consecration of the Elements. In Answer to this, again it must be acknowledged, *first*, that the * *Greeks* indeed expounded their Prayer there, that it was for the Holy Ghost to make that Bread Christ's Body, ἐν ἡμῖν, in us, which may something favour this Gloss; but remember they called it Bread still. And in that Prayer in the *Greek* Liturgy of St. *Chrysostom*, there is nothing relating to us, till after μεταβάλλειν, to change them by thy holy Spirit; where the modern *Greeks* lay the Stress of their Consecration or Change. Although *Besfarion*, to serve his own Purpose, hath placed the Words *to us* before it, in that Solution which he gave to the Pope.

Neither is there any Thing relating to the Communicants, in the *Latins* Prayer for the Acceptance of the Gifts, nor in the next, till after they have prayed for an Angel to carry them up to Heaven; *i. e.* that being there placed,

* *i. e.* Three *Greek* Bishops only. See *Pfaff*. p. 414.

placed, they may be sanctified. So that there is as much Profit prayed to accrue to the Gifts, as to the Communicants, in the *Greek* Liturgies, and the *Roman* Missal.

Moreover, if, as *Goar* pretends, we have full Possession of the Blessing promised, when the Words of our Lord are spoken, This is my Body, the Prayers of the Priest would be not only, as the *Latins* say, *Ματαιόντι καὶ παρέλκον πρᾶγμα*, A vain and impertinent Work, but plainly derogatory from the Power and Glory of Christ, in praying for the holy Spirit to do a Thing which, as they say, is done already by him, and could be no more than so many repeated Affronts.

But since the primitive Authors of the Mass plainly meant only a spiritual Sacrifice, a spiritual Nourishment, a spiritual Effect in us, and so a spiritual Change only, no Wonder if they added several Prayers and Suffrages tending to the same End, after a Narration of Christ's Action and Institution; and in this Sense, it is very commendable what *Goar*, *Bessarion*, and others say, that out of a fervent Zeal, and insatiable Love, and almost incredible Desire, to obtain this blessed End, they might again and again make their Petitions, for only in this Sense, as to this Point, that Saying of *Theodoritus* may be applied, *Non satiatur orando justus*.

I shall now proceed to the other principal Point which I undertook; and that is to an-

swer two Objections which have been brought against the Manner of celebrating the holy Communion, particularly by Dr. Hicks, Dr. Brett, Dr. Grabe, and Mr. Johnson.

The first is, of the Oblation and Sacrifice of the Eucharist.

That in order to perform this *Service* rightly, the Bread and Wine ought to be presented to God, *i. e.* offered to God, as other material Gifts and Oblations, of which the ancient Sacrifices consisted, were presented; that this external Oblation of the Bread and Wine to God, as the true Sacrifice of the new Law, and external Oblation, as the mysterious Body and Blood of Christ, may be proved necessary from the Words of Institution, and other Passages of the more divine, canonical Scriptures, that without it the Consecration is imperfect, not performed according to Christ's Institution; and the wilful Omission of it an inexcusable Error in the *Church of England*.

That in all the ancient Liturgies, these Words of Oblation always followed the Words of Institution: For in the *Clementine*, which is a Standard and Test by which all the others are to be tried, as it contains nothing but what was practised in the Celebration of the Eucharist before the Council of *Nice*, *i. e.* during the three first Centuries; there are these oblatory Words, We offer to thee our King and our God, according to Christ's Institution, this Bread and this Cup.

In

In that of *St. Chrysostom* there are Words parallel, We offer to thee thine own through all, and in all; We praise thee, We bless thee, We give Thanks to thee, O Lord, and beseech thee, O our God; We offer to thee this reasonable, and unbloody Service. In that of *St. James*; We Sinners offer to thee, O Lord, this tremendous and unbloody Sacrifice. In *St. Mark's*, Of thine own Gifts, we have laid thine own before thee, O Lord our God. And the *Roman Missal* has, We offer unto thy glorious Majesty, of thine own Gifts and Presents, a pure + Host, an holy + Host, an immaculate + Host, the holy + Bread of eternal Life, and the Cup of everlasting Salvation: ' That the Oblation, as well as the Words of ' Institution, accompanies, and is included in ' the Thanksgiving Form of Prayer, which is ' continued to the End of the Oblation, to ' the Consecration itself'

And from the Words of Institution it is argued, * that Jesus taught this new Oblation to his Apostles, which the Church received from

* *St. Cyprian*, Ep. 63. ' Admonitos autem nos scias, ' ut in calice offerendo, Dominica traditio servetur, neque ' aliud fiat à nobis, quam quod pro nobis Dominus prior ' fecerit; ut calix qui in commemoratione ejus offertur: ' But know, that we are commanded in offering the Cup, to observe the Ordinance of our Lord, and to do no other Thing but what he first did; that is to say, that the Cup which is offered in Remembrance of him.

Cyp. Ep. 63. ' Qui sacrificium Deo Patri obtulit — ' i. e. panem & vinum.'

from them, and offers throughout the whole World, according to the Words of † St. *Irenaeus*, and of which, he says, the * Prophet *Malachi* foretold, *I have no Pleasure in you, saith the Lord of Hosts, neither will I accept an Offering at your Hands, &c.*

○ That *Justin Martyr* calls it, in his Dialogue with *Trypho* the Jew, † an Oblation commanded by our Lord, and says, that the Meat-offering of fine Flour, offered in the Old Testament, was a Type thereof, that it was prefigured by the Prophet *Malachi*, Chap. i. 10, 11, and is therefore to be offered according to the Command of our Lord.

In Answer to this it must be granted, that the Manner of consecrating this Sacrament by the primitive Christians, according to all the Liturgies of the Church, both of the East and West, was by a two-fold, solemn Oblation of the Gifts, and the Invocation of the Holy Ghost upon the Elements, to make them the Body

† Book iv. c. 17. §. 5. *against the Heresies*: Our Lord giving Counsel to his Disciples to offer to God the First-fruits of his Creatures, not as if he wanted, but that they should be neither unfruitful or ungrateful, took that which is of his Creature, Bread, and gave Thanks, saying, This is my Body; likewise the Cup, which is his Creature, according to us, and confessed it to be his Blood. And taught a new Oblation of the New Testament, which the Church receiving from the Apostles, offers to God, &c.

* Of which *Malachi* foretold Chap. i. 10, 11.

† See *Pfaffius*, p. 269, 272. and *Hicks's Translation Chri. Priesthood*, p. 55.

Body and Blood of Christ; the first, an Oblation of the Gifts to the Bishop or officiating Minister, to be consecrated, not yet placed upon the Altar; and because for this End they were brought to him by the Laity, they were called *Πρόσφοροι* and *Θυσίαι*, Offerings and Sacrifices, according to the *Apostolical Constitutions*, Book ii. c. 27. *Προσέκειν ἔν κ' ὑμᾶς ἀδελφοὶ τὰς θυσίας ὑμῶν ἥτι προσφύρας τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ προσφέρειν.* It becometh you, Brethren, to bring your Gifts or Offerings to the Bishop. The other, distinct from this, was an Oblation of them to God by the Bishop or officiating Minister, by means of an oblatory Prayer; of this Dr. *John Clark* gives us the following Account.

It was a received Custom in the primitive Church, that the ancient Christians coming to the Celebration of the Eucharist, should place Bread and Wine upon the holy Table, and offer it to God, giving him Thanks for his Benefits, out of which a certain Part was consecrated in the Eucharist; and Prayers were said over this Oblation for the gracious Acceptance thereof.

The Rites of celebrating the Eucharist were by our Saviour transferred from those in use among the *Jews*, chiefly the Rites of the Paschal Supper; and Apostolical Men thought it no Crime, if thereunto they added the Oblation of Gifts to be consecrated, to which the *Jews*, in their holy Things, had been accustomed. The Apostles made new Constitutions concerning

cerning religious Rites, as appears from 1 *Cor.* xi. 34. vii. 6, 10, 12, 25. To these belong the Traditions by Word, mentioned 2 *Thef.* ii. 15. and, among the rest, the eucharistical Oblation, although not instituted by them primarily in all Churches, we suppose were in those collected out of the *Jews*, whose Rites they would retain as indifferent; which for a season were lawful, tho' not necessary, lest they should alienate their Minds from the Christian Faith. See *Acts* xvi. 3. xviii. 18. xxi. 23, and following. 1 *Cor.* ix. 20, 23. Apostolical Men afterwards followed this Rite of Oblation; so that by degrees it crept into an universal Custom of the Church: But in some Churches there was no such Rite observed, particularly in that of *Antioch* in St. *Ignatius's* Time, of which he was Bishop; neither in the Time of St. *Origen*; for neither of them in their Accounts of this Sacrament, mention a Word of this Oblation.

And as to what is argued from the Words of Institution, no other Oblation can be proved from thence, than that already mentioned in the Explication of the Words, *Εὐχαριστία*, Thanksgiving, and *Εὐλογία*, Blessing, of our Saviour in the Words of Institution; and as therein no such Words are contained as, *We offer to God, We have laid thine own before thee*; which are mentioned in the Objection to be necessary, we cannot think ourselves under any absolute Necessity, in making a spiritual eucharistical

eucharistical Oblation, to use such Phrases; or that the wilful Omission thereof in the eucharistical Service, is an inexcusable Error in the Church of *England*: As it is contained, [as shall be proved] in Substance in our Liturgy.

Justin Martyr explains the pure Offering foretold *Mal. i. 10.* to be the Bread and Cup; but does so on account of the Eucharist and Prayer, whereby they are offered, dedicated, and consecrated to God; and farther explains himself, in his Dialogue with *Trypho*, p. 346. saying that God accepts no Sacrifices but from his Priests, made in every Place in the Earth by all Christians, and witnesseth that they are acceptable to him; thereby shewing that our Oblations are not to be compared to the Nature of the Sacrifices of the Old Testament. And indeed from the different Explications of *Mal. i. 10.* by the Fathers, no Apostolical Tradition can be formed. *Eusebius*, *Demon. Evan.* Book i. c. 6. explains the pure Offering by *Ευχὰς*, and *ἔργα εὐσεβείᾳ*, Prayers, and holy Works; the Apostolical Constitutions by the Oblation of First-fruits and Tythes; *Justin Martyr* and *Irenæus*, of the external Oblation of Gifts to be consecrated, but with Prayers thereunto joined. And *Tertullian* asserts, that *Malachi* spoke there of the Preaching the divine Word and Prayers. Although *Irenæus*, Book iv. c. 17. §. 6. *against the Heresies*, by the pure Offering, seems to understand only the glorifying the Name of God; and the Incense

he explains from *Rev.* v. 8. and says it is the Prayers of the Saints.

Hence it is plain, that, according to *Justin Martyr* and *Irenæus*, the Life of the new Oblation, which is made in the New Testament, and instituted by Christ, are the Prayers whereby the Gifts are offered, dedicated and consecrated to God: For that external Rite, whereby they were placed upon the Altar, or Table, with Prayers, and then afterwards offered to God, being a Rite purely indifferent, pertaining not to Faith, but Discipline, is not to be obtruded as necessary; being a Ceremony which does not perfect the new Sacrifice of the New Testament; which is to be offered in Spirit and in Truth. But Prayers being added, whereby the Name of God is glorified, Thanks are rendered to him, for his Gifts, Acknowledgment made that we receive them of him, and the Sanctification of the Gifts are desired; that spiritual and eucharistical Oblation is perfected. In this Sense no Protestant denies the Reasonableness or Necessity of an eucharistical Oblation; but that a spiritual Virtue should be ascribed to indifferent Rites, and Words and Phrases, which Christ in the Gospel has not commanded.

Dr. *Hicks*, to prove this Oblation, begins with that Passage in *Mat.* v. 23, 24. where are these Words, *If thou bring thy Gift to the Altar, &c.* He says very truly, that δῶρον here signifies

signifies Oblation, as likewise Chap. viii. 4. xxiii. 18. And that Christ said these Things to his Disciples, that by Anticipation by the Name of *δωρε*, Oblation, the Oblation of the Eucharist is to be understood ; produces many Examples afterwards of this Kind of Anticipation, and Passages from the Fathers, which explain the afore-cited Text of the eucharistical Oblation.

To which, first, I reply, that Christ held this Discourse not only before his Disciples, but before a Multitude of the *Jews*, who did not yet believe in him ; this is plain from *Mat.* v. 1. vii. 28.

2dly, He without Doubt so spoke to them, that he might be understood ; but if we suppose him to have spoken of the Eucharist, which then was not instituted, it is impossible they should understand the Sense of what he said. Again, Anticipations in another Place are no Proof of one here : The Place treats of some Worship known, of all Kinds of Oblations, First-fruits, and Gifts to be offered according to the Law of *Moses* ; as *Irenæus* speaks, By a Gift Honour and Affection toward the King is shewn ; which the Lord willing us to offer in all Simplicity and Innocence, spoke before, saying, When *thou bringest thy Gift to the Altar*, &c. we should offer the First-fruits of his Creatures, as said *Moses*, *Thou shalt not appear empty before the Lord thy God.*

3dly, From those Passages of the Fathers * no more can be concluded than this, that when they spoke of Reconciliation as a necessary Preparation to the holy Communion, they alluded to that Saying of our Saviour, and applied what he said of *Jewish* Oblations to the eucharistical, and with the greater Emphasis, because that Oblation is more noble and holy than any others. Hence, *Apost. Const.* Book ii. c. 53. it is explained of all Prayers and Thanksgivings: But a Gift to God is every one's Prayer and Thanksgiving. He proceeds to the Words of Institution; *ἄρτο ποιεῖτε*, ought to be translated *hoc offerte*, offer this, that the latter, which is *עָרַב* in the *Hebrew*, is a sacrificial Term. See my Sermon, *A true Account of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*, p. 20, and following.

Another Argument the Doctor brings for the eucharistical Oblation, is taken from 1 Cor. ix. 13. *Do you not know that they which minister about holy Things, live of the Things of the Temple? and they which wait at the Altar, are Partakers with the Altar?* For there being an Altar, supposeth there must be a Sacrifice, as the *Greek* Word *θυσία*, Sacrifice, takes its Name from *θυσιαστήριον*, an Altar. But if we rightly examine this Passage, we shall find that the Apostle speaks here of the Priests of the Old Testament,

* *Tertull.* de Patien. c. 12. *De Or.* c. 10. *Cyp.* de Un. Ecc. *De Or. Dom.* *Euseb.* de Vit. Con. book iv. c. 41, &c.

Testament, and compares them with those who preach the Gospel; and for this End, that as they were fed by the Offerings of the Altar, so are these to be maintained by those who hear the Gospel. Another Text he produces to the same Purpose from *Heb. xiii. 10, 11, 12. We have an Altar, whereof they have no Right to eat, which serve the Tabernacle.* Here it is not clear, that the Apostle speaks of an Altar properly so called, where the Lord's Table seems rather to be understood, and the eating there a Feast upon a Sacrifice: By the Altar here some likewise understand Christ himself, who is so called sometimes by the Antients, *Cyril. Alex. de Christo*, he therefore is the Altar, he is the Sacrifice and the high Priest, *Book de Ad. p. 310.* This seems more probable, because *Ver. 13.* we are exhorted to go forth unto him without the Camp, where is no other Altar; and because *Ver. 15, 16.* there are no Sacrifices in the New Testament, but the Sacrifice of Praise, the Fruit of our Lips, giving Thanks, or confessing to him, doing good, communicating, &c. Lastly, since Christ did not consecrate this Sacrament upon an Altar, but did it as they were eating, *Mat. xxvi. 26.* either a Sacrifice may be offered without an Altar, or the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is not a Sacrifice. The Meaning of *St. Paul* in the aforecited Passage is as follows, we permit not those to eat of the Sacrament of the Body of our Lord,
which

which we celebrate, who still solemnize the *Jewish* Rites, and the ceremonial Law, and observe the Distinction of Meats. Because Christ having suffered without *Jerusalem*, first fulfilled, therefore abrogated the *Jewish* Rite or Type, according to which the Bodies of those Animals were burnt without the Camp, whose Blood was brought into the Sanctuary to make Expiation for Sins, and therefore no Part of them could be eaten by the Priest, so they who, under the Gospel, adhere to that Way of Worship, cannot partake of Christ, who is the Truth of that Type; for that Reason intimating to us, that going to him without the Gates, *i. e.* forsaking all *Jewish* Ceremonies, we should bear his Reproach, and own ourselves Followers of the crucified Jesus. He proceeds, and appeals to *1 Cor. x. 20, 21.* *But I say, that the Things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to Devils, and not to God; and I would not that ye should have Fellowship with Devils. Ye cannot drink the Cup of the Lord and the Cup of Devils; ye cannot be Partakers of the Lord's Table and the Table of Devils.* But here is no mention made either of Altar or Oblation, but only of a Feast upon a Sacrifice. Thus *Cornelius à Lapide* explains the Passage: The Apostle by the Table of Devils does not understand the idolatrous Altars of the Gentiles, upon which they slew their Sacrifices to Devils; but the Table upon which, after the Sacrifices were

were finished, out of the Meats, and Drinks, offered, they Instituted their Banquets, either at home or in their Temples.

But the Doctor says, that the Table of the Lord is therefore compared with the Table of the Devils, because in both those Things are offered, which afterwards were set out to be eat up, and drank. To which I shall answer in the Words of an excellent Divine, translated into *English*: This Phrase to eat of the Altar, is legal; in some Sacrifices of the Law, Part belonged to God, Part to the Priest, and Part to the People who offered them. And as the *Jews* only had a right to eat of their Sacrifices, so had Christians only of theirs; whence the Eucharist is explained to be nothing but a Feast upon a Sacrifice, and the Altar only a Table upon which the Offerings are put, not offered*.

In Similitudes and Comparisons, we are not to suppose the Relations, and Accounts of Matters compared, should in every Particular answer each other; or because it is said Ver. 20. *The Things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to Devils, and not to God*; and we must acknowledge, that what the Gentiles sacrificed they slew; we must suppose therefore, that what the Ministers of the Gospel sacrifice in the Eucharist, if they sacrifice at all, they slay it.

* See Mr. *Pfaffius*'s Explication of the whole Passage, p. 192. 1 *Cor.* viii. 10. x. 27, 28.

The Ancients called the Sacrament a Sacrifice, as † *Irenæus* did, because it consisted of a Προσφορά, or Gift offered to God.

Likewise because it recalls and represents to our Memory the Sacrifice of Christ offered upon the Cross. And the modern Divines always did the same, as appears from the following Passages.

Bishop *Brownrige*, Bishop of *Exeter*, in a Sermon of his upon *Gen. iv. 3, 4, 5, 6. p. 199.* hath the following Words; *Heb. xiii. 15. Let us offer the Sacrifice of Praise to God continually, the Fruit of our Lips, giving Thanks unto his Name*; and in this Kind the great Sacrifice of the Christian Church is the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; the great Commemoration of the great Benefit of our Redeemer.

So Archbishop *Sharp*, in a Sermon by him preached before the King and Queen, on *Heb. ix. 26. at Whitehall on Christmas-day*, speaks to the same Purpose: "We do not indeed deny, but that every Time we approach the Lord's Table, for the receiving of the holy Communion, we offer Sacrifices to God; for we offer our Alms, which we beg of God to accept as our Oblations; and these, in the Language of the Scripture, are called Sacrifices with which God is well pleased. We likewise offer our Sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving

† See Eulog. Alex. in Bibl. Photii, p. 280, cited by *Pfaffius*, p. 28. Chris. Hom. xvii. in Ep. ad Heb. ibid.

giving to God for the Death of our Saviour; and all our Prayers and Supplications we put up in his Name: And in the Virtue, and for the Merits of that Sacrifice, he offered to God in our Behalf; and in so doing we commemorate that Sacrifice both to God and before Men. And this is all, we are confident, that the ancient Church meant by the great Christian Sacrifice, or the Sacrifice of the Altar."

But any discerning Reader may perceive, that the main Part of the Controversy is only a Dispute about Words, because they differ about the Definition of a true propitiatory Sacrifice, properly so called.

First, It is argued, the Laicks were not permitted *εὐχαριστῆσαι ἀνοίοντες*, to offer the Eucharist, *Hicks's Christian Priesthood*, p. 113. In *Tertullian, de Exhortatione Castitatis*, cap. 11.

'Et commendabis illas per sacerdotem, rectè autem dicitur offerre per sacerdotem, quia solius sacerdotis est, non verò laicorum est offerre sacrificium:'. And wilt thou commend them by a Priest? but it is rightly said to offer by a Priest, because it only belongs to a Priest, but not to Laicks, to offer Sacrifice. To this the Answer to the first Objection may serve.

2dly, That the Apostle alludeth to it, when he calls the Gentiles an Offering, *Rom. xv. 16*. *That I should be the Minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, ministring the Gospel of God, that the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable,*

table, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost; where the Offering is called προσφορά τῶν ἑθνῶν, and the Minister λειτουργὸν ἱερουργεῖται, a Minister, or Priest officiating in holy Things; or ἱερεὺς, from the Hebrew Word *cohen*, which, as Dr. Hicks observes, may be rendered by either of them, according to the common Notion which the Christians had of the eucharistical Oblation being sanctified by the Holy Ghost, [that is, by the Invocation for the Descent of the Holy Ghost] according to the ancient Liturgies; and therefore the Offering of the Gentiles must allude to the Offering of the Eucharist: And if the Allusion of the Gentiles to the eucharistical Sacrifice, because it is sanctified by the Holy Ghost, intitles them to be called an Offering or Sacrifice, then for the same Reason, the Eucharist, to which the Allusion is made, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost, must intitle it to be called a proper Sacrifice, [although it is certain, that this Text has been produced to prove the spiritual Sacrifice of preaching the Gospel, by which the Gentiles were converted to Christianity].

But then, argues the Doctor, &c. if the Offering of the Gentiles means the Eucharist, which it is often called by *Justin Martyr* and other ancient Fathers, in Opposition to the Jewish Sacrifice, then the Argument is directly in Proof of the eucharistical Sacrifice. * To which an Answer is already given.

And

* See the Answer to the first Objection, p. 150.

And the following Prophecy of *Esaias* calls the Gentiles that *Mincha* which was to be offered up by the Preaching of the Gospel; *Isa.* lxvi. 20, 21.

והביאו את כל-אחיכם מכל-הגוים מנחה לי הוה
בסוסים וברכב ובצבים וב פרים ובכרכרות על הר
קדשי ירושלם אמר יהוה כאשר יביאו בני ישראל המנחה
בכלי מהור בית יהוה וגם-מהם:
אקח לכהנים ללויים אמר יהוה:

Isa. lxvi. 20, 21. *And they shall bring all your Brethren for an Offering unto the Lord, out of all Nations, upon Horses, and in Chariots, and in Litters, and upon Mules, and upon swift Beasts, to my holy Mountain Jerusalem, saith the Lord, as the Children of Israel bring an Offering in a clean Vessel into the House of the Lord.*

And I will also take of them for Priests, and for Levites, saith the Lord.

For the *Mincha* or Meat-offering prefigured the Persons of Christians, who, by *St. Paul's* ministering the Gospel to the Gentiles, were sanctified to be pure Oblations. But this Allusion of the Apostle being founded on mere Conjecture, is not sufficient to prove the Eucharist to be an Oblation: For all Christian Oblations are spiritual, *John* iv. 21. Διότι καὶ ἡ προσφορά τῆς εὐχαριστίας οὐκ ἐστὶ σαρκικὴ ἀλλὰ πνευματικὴ καὶ ἐν τέτῳ κα-
σαρά. Therefore the Oblation of the Eucharist is not carnal, but spiritual, and therein pure. *Pfaff. Fragm. Anecd.* p. 26. 121.

But admitting the Service of the Eucharist not to be a Sacrifice in a true and proper, but

metaphorical Sense, yet Dr. *Hicks*, and those of his Opinion, do not deny but it is the most excellent of all Sacrifices; only give the Name of metaphorical Sacrifice to Obedience and the whole spiritual Worship and Service of Religion. Thus, citing a Passage in *Justin Martyr*, Ταῦτα γὰρ μονα καὶ χριστιανοὶ παρέλαβον ποιεῖν καὶ ἐπ' ἀναμνήσι, &c. These Prayers and Thanksgivings are the only perfect and well-pleasing Sacrifices, which Christians have undertaken to offer in that Remembrance of their Food, &c. On these Words he thus argues: That though they be the only Sacrifices, as to their Excellency and Acceptance with God, yet this doth not hinder, that the other eucharistical Sacrifices may be called Sacrifices or Oblations; as when in Scripture it is said, That there is none good but one, that is God, the Meaning is in an eminent and super-excellent Degree, &c.

And the same Way of arguing is used upon that Passage in *Greg. Nazianzen*, *Orat. i.* p. 48. Ταῦτα ἔν ἐιδῶς ἔγω, καὶ ὅτι μηδεὶς ἄξιός τῃ μεγάλῃ, καὶ Θεῷ, καὶ Δυσίαν καὶ ἀρχιερέως, ὅστις μὴ πρότερον ἑαυτὸν παρέστησε Δυσίαν ζῶσαν ἁγίαν, μηδὲ ἔθυσσε τῷ Θεῷ Δυσίαν αἰνήσεως καὶ πνεῦμα συντετριμμένον ἦν μόνον ὃ πάντα δεῖ ἀπαιτεῖ παρ ἡμῶν Δυσίαν. Knowing these Things, and that no Man is worthy of the great God, Sacrifice, and High Priest, who hath not first presented himself a living and holy Sacrifice to God, or not sacrificed to God the Sacrifice of Praise and a contrite Heart, which is the only Sacrifice, which he who bestows all Things, requires

requires of us. Upon which Passage * this learned Writer saith, that *Gregory Nazianzen* judged *the external Sacrifice to be only nominal*, in Opposition to the real internal Sacrifice, and that the Word ONLY, when applied to the Sacrifice of Praise and a contrite Spirit, is not to be understood in the exclusive Sense; but signifies the Excellence of the spiritual, which he calls only metaphorical, above the true and proper material Sacrifices.

And indeed it is the Excellence of one above the other, which only is worth contending for; and in this Point all Sides seem to be perfectly agreed; and that spiritual Sacrifices, whether called real or metaphorical, are as much preferable to the others, as Truth is to Falsehood, and the Substance to the Shadow.

" Here, says he, it is to be observed, that the Terms of Exception in all Languages, are not to be taken in an exclusive, but sometimes in a comparative Sense, as only denoting the Things signified, by the Names to which they are joined, to be the chief or most eminent and excellent of their Kind. So, when the Father here says, that the Sacrifice of a contrite Heart is the only Sacrifice God requires, he means the chief and most excellent Sacrifice, without which no other Sacrifice is acceptable to him; as the Father herein saying, that the internal Sacrifice of a contrite Heart

* *Hicks's* Christ. Priesthood asserted, p. 29, 30.

Heart was the only Sacrifice God requires, meant not to exclude the external Oblation, or Sacrifice of Bread and Wine."—The former he calls metaphorically a living, holy and acceptable, and his reasonable Service, in Allusion to *Rom. xii. 1.*

From a Passage in *Justin Martyr*, "Οτι μὲν ἐν εὐχαίᾳ καὶ εὐχαριστίᾳ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀξίων γινόμεναι τέλειαι μόναι καὶ εὐάρεστοί εἰσι τῷ Θεῷ θυσιαι καὶ αὐτὸς φημι, That Prayers and Thanksgivings made by those that are worthy, are the only perfect and acceptable Sacrifices to God; for those only Christians have undertaken to offer in that Remembrance of their Food, both dry and liquid, in which a Remembrance is made of the Passion, which the God of Gods suffered thereby; First, it appears, that the Oblation of the Eucharist is not proper and perfect; but that Prayers and Thanksgivings only deserve that Name: 2dly, And that the same was not commanded or enjoined by Christ or his Apostles; which seems at a Blow to destroy his whole Opinion. Yet in commenting upon the 16th Homily of *St. Chrysostom* on *Mat. v.* to wit, the Words, for having said, leave there thy Gift, he did not stop there, but added, before the Altar.—A Gift and a Sacrifice, I mean Prayer and Alms, for these are Sacrifices also, he observes as follows: Here the Father distinguishes between the mere oral Sacrifice of Prayer and Thanksgiving, and the real Sacrifice or Oblation of the Bread and Wine

Wine with Praise and Thanksgiving; between Sacrifice in the most eminent, proper Sense, for an external, material Sacrifice, presented unto God at the Altar, and Sacrifice only in the less proper and analogical Sense, for Praise and Thanksgiving, and Alms.

The next Objection is, that the Invocation for the Descent of the holy Spirit upon the Elements, to make them the Body and Blood of Christ, was the Practice of the Universal Church in all Places, immediately following the Oblation, and the Words of Institution, till *Bucer* and *Martyr* contrived to have it expunged the Liturgy of the Church of *England*; we conclude, the Practice is an Institution of Christ, which the Apostles taught wheresoever they preached the Gospel; consequently, that without such a Petition, the Consecration is lame and defective, and not performed according to our Saviour's Institution.

In Answer to this we say, that we acknowledge the Prayers, to which is annexed the Invocation of the Holy Ghost, are very good, of great Antiquity, and were always used in the *Greek Church*: But the reformed Church is not the first who laid them aside, for they are omitted in the *Roman Missal*: And yet it is acknowledged by * a learned Writer, who hath charged our Liturgy with Imperfection for the want of them, that the Prayer in the
Roman

* Dr. Brett's Pri. Lit. p. 126.

Roman Canon, in which the Prayer of Invocation is not used, is of equal Import therewith, although the Phrase be altered; his Words are, "It prays for God's particular Blessing upon the Elements, that he would make them the Body and Blood of Christ, which is not materially different from praying for the Descent of the Holy Ghost for that Purpose, since the spiritual Blessings of God are all conferred upon us by the Operation of the holy Spirit." Add to this, that St. *Irenæus* is the first of the Christian Fathers, who mentions this 'Επίκλησις, or Prayer of Invocation, to have been used in consecrating this Sacrament, who did not write until the latter Part of the second Century: And although he mentions the Hereticks *Marcus* and *Theodotus*, in Imitation of the Catholicks, to have used this Word of Invocation; and *Maximus*, a Writer of the same Age, introduces a Heretick confessing that the Holy Ghost comes upon the Eucharist.

And St. *Cyprian* * speaks of a Heretick Woman, who, in consecrating the Eucharist, used an Invocation not contemptible, or Sacrament of the accustomed Predication. Yet *Justin Martyr* in his long Account of the Eucharist, in his second Apology for the Christians, p. 97, 98. although Contemporary with *Irenæus*, and mentions the Prayers therein used, which he calls 'Ευχαριστία and 'Ευλογία, Thanksgiving and Blessing,

* Epist. 75.

Blessing, says nothing at all of the Invocation; which doubtless he would have done, had it been received in all Churches in his Time. So that the earliest Time in which it began to be universally used in the Church, was in the Time of * *St. Cyril of Jerusalem*, who lived in the fourth Century: And as it is very plain that the Apostles, and the Fathers their Successors, equally differ from each other, in their Forms of Consecration Prayers, as to particular Words and Phrases, though they all drew their Instructions from those which they had received concerning the Virtue and Power of the Holy Ghost, the Giver of Life, to sanctify and consecrate the Gifts, it follows, that what *Dr. Hicks* says, that this Account of the Manner of administering the Sacrament, according to the Apostolical Constitutions, or of the eucharistical Service, is most agreeable to the Accounts we have of it, and of the Administration thereof, in the first Apology of *Justin Martyr*; and to the Doctrine of it, in his Dialogue with *Trypho*; and to the primitive and Apostolical Form, is so far from being proved by the general Consent of ancient Writers, that that can be no other than a Collection of such Forms as were afterwards used in some Churches, in Times much later than those of the Apostles.

* *Pfaffius* in *Præf.*

Y

Hence

Hence then appears sufficient Reason for striking out of our Liturgy the Form of Invocation; for since no particular Form is prescribed in holy Scripture, and every Church is at Liberty to make use of such Forms, as shall best suit with their Circumstances, provided the Analogy of Faith be preserved, it is evident, that whatever Prayers answer the End of our Duty, may as lawfully and as piously be used, as a formal Petition for the Descent of the Holy Ghost.

And we certainly have in Substance, in our excellent Liturgy, every Petition that can be desired of that Kind, which the *Greek* Liturgies contained, couched under these Expressions:

“ Grant that we, receiving these thy Creatures of Bread and Wine, according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ’s holy Institution, may be Partakers of his most precious Body and Blood, who in the same Night, &c.”

And since other prudential Reasons might induce the wise Compilers of our Liturgy to strike out such a particular Form, of which an ill Use had been made, to serve the Ends of
* Superstition, no sufficient Reason can be assigned, why ours, any more than other Churches, should be deprived of the Liberty of substituting another Form in the stead of it,

* See *Brett* on the principal Liturgies, p. 184. *Pfaff*.
Not. in *S. Iren. Fragm. Anecd.* p. 79.

it, equally conducive to the Ends of Edification, but not liable to the same Abuse to which the other was. "I see no Reason, said an excellent * Writer, why we may not as well ask of God any Blessing, understanding that he will give it by his holy Spirit, as to make a formal Invocation for him to send down his holy Spirit for that Purpose."

Moreover the Age of *Justin Martyr*, which was about the Middle of the second Century, had already revolted from the apostolical Simplicity, therefore ought not to be esteemed as a Guide or Pattern to future Ages in this Particular; for in the apostolical Age, the eucharistical Prayers and Thanksgivings had been plain and short †; but afterwards they were drawn out to a much greater length, having been made by the Minister extempore. ‡ Nor indeed were there any written Liturgies used at all in the Church, until after the Council of *Nice*, that is, during the three first Centuries, nor until St. *Basil's* Time, that is, fifty Years after; so that the Minister officiated only as well he could, without any Form; as appears from the Words ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ, as well as he is able, used in the *Apost. Constit. l. viii. c. 12. §. 40.* Ἐυχαριστῶμέν σοι ----- ἐχ' ὅσον ὀφείλομεν, ἀλλ' ὅσον δυνάμεθα, We give Thanks to thee, not

Y 2

as

* Dr. *Waterland's* Rev. of the Doct. of the Euch. p. 401.

† *Pfaffius*, Dissert. de Consec. vet. Euch. p. 368.

‡ *Brett's Coll.* p. 29, &c.

as we ought, but as we are able; and from a like Phrase in *Origen*, in his Book against *Celsus*, p. 386. Τὸν ἑνα Θεόν, καὶ τὸν ἑνα Υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ λόγον καὶ εἰκόνα, ταῖς κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν ἡμῖν ἱκεσίαις καὶ αἰχμασίαις σέβομεν, We worship the one God and his one Son, or Word and Image, as well as we are able, with Supplications and Prayers. And farther, from *Justin Martyr*, Apol. ii. p. 97. where he says of the officiating Minister, that he did give Thanks to God with a very long Thanksgiving Prayer; Καὶ εὐχαριστῶν ὑπὲρ τῆ κατηξιώσθαι τέτων παρ αὐτῷ ΕΠΙ ΠΟΛΥ παύται, i. e. He makes a Thanksgiving Prayer of a great length, for vouchsafing us worthy of these his Creatures. In which Part of the divine Service *Marcus* the Heretick (of whom *Irenæus*, *adv. Hær.* l. i. c. 13. §. 2. takes notice, for having imitated the Church in the Manner of her performing publick Worship) did imitate the officiating Priest, ἐπὶ πλέον ἐκτείνων τὸν λόγον τῆς ἐπικλήσεως, i. e. very much extending the Word of Invocation, or Prayer of Invocation.

But that all Churches in that early Age of Christianity did not, in the Administration of the holy Communion, use the ἐπίκλησις, or Invocation of the Holy Ghost, which is now in Oriental Liturgies, we have the following Reason to believe, and that is, because *Dionysius* the *Areopagite*, (of whom *St. Luke* makes honourable mention, *Acts* xvii. 33.) in the third Chapter of his Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, where with much Care and Pains he treats of the

Manner

Manner of celebrating the holy Eucharist in his Days) when he makes mention of the Prayers used upon that Occasion, yet says nothing of any sacerdotal Oblation of the Gifts to God the Father, nothing of the Ἐπίκλησις, or Invocation of the Holy Ghost, although at the same time he mentions the Altar, the Priest, and the other Rites which were then used; such as the Washing of the Fingers of the Priest, Reading the Diptychs, the *Osculum Pacis* or Kiss of Peace, and several Terms used in Sacrifices.

Concerning those Things which are performed in the Assembly, *Pfaff. p. 377. n. 2.*

Οἱ δὲ τῆς λειτουργικῆς διακοσμήσεως ἔκκριτοι σὺν τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν ἐπὶ τῷ Θεῷ θυσιάσῃς προτιθέασιν τὸν ἱερὸν ἄρτον καὶ τὸ τῆς εὐλογίας προτήριον, προομολογηθείσης ὑπὸ παντὸς τῷ τῆς ἐκκλησίας πληρώματος τῆς καθολικῆς ὑμολογίας, πρὸς οἷς ὁ Θεὸς ἱεράρχης εὐχὴν ἱερὰν τελεῖ καὶ τὴν ἁγίαν εἰρήνην ἅπασιν διαγγέλλει καὶ ἀσπασαμένων ἀλλήλους ἀπάντων ἡ μουσικὴ τῶν ἱερῶν πλυχῶν ἀνάρρησις ἐπιτελεῖται. N. 3. §. 7. Τὸν ὕμνον δὲ τῶτον οἱ μὲν ὑμολογίαν καλεῖσιν, οἱ δὲ τῆς θρησκείας τὸ σύμβολον, ἄλλοι δὲ ὡς οἶμαι, Θεϊότερον ἱεραρχικὴν εὐχαριστίαν ὡς περιεκτικὴν τῶν εἰς ἡμᾶς θεοθεν ἀφικόμενων ἱερῶν δώρων. δοκεῖ γάρ μοι τῶν ὑμνεμένων ἀπασῶν θεωρητῶν ἡ πραγματεία περὶ ἡμᾶς γεγονέναι τὴν μὲν ἐστίαν ἡμῶν καὶ ζωὴν ἀγαθοειδῶς ὑποστήσασα καὶ ἀρχετύποις κάλλεσι τὰ θεοειδῆς ἡμῶν μορφώτατα καὶ θεοτέρας ἕξεως καὶ ἀναγωγῆς ἐν μετεσθία καταστήσασα, κατιδέσθαι δὲ τὴν ἐξ ἀπροσεξίας ἐγγενομένην ἡμῖν ἐρημίαν τῶν θείων δωρεῶν ἐπισκηναστοῖς ἡμᾶς ἀγαθοῖς εἰς τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἀνακωλέσασθαι καὶ τῇ παντελεῖ τῶν ἡμετέρων προσλήψει τὴν τελειοτάτην τῶν οἰκείων μετάδοσιν
ἀγαθῶν-

ἀγαθουργῆσαι καὶ ταύτῃ κοινωνίαν ἡμῖν Θεῷ καὶ τῶν Θεῶν δω-
 ρήσασθαι. §. 12. Ὁ Θεὸς ἱεράρχης ἐπὶ τῇ Θεῇ θυσιαστη-
 ρίᾳ καταστὰς ὑμνεῖ τὰς εἰρημένους ἱεράς θειουργίας Ἰησοῦ τῆς
 Θειοτάτης ἡμῶν προνοίας, ὥς ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ τῇ γένεσι ἡμῶν
 εὐδοκίᾳ τῇ παναγεσάτῃ πατρὸς ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ κατὰ τὸ
 λόγιον ἐτελείωσεν. ὑμνήσας δὲ καὶ τὴν σεβασμίαν αὐτῶν καὶ
 νοσητὴν θεωρίαν ἐν νοεροῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἐποπτεύσας, ἐπὶ τὴν
 συμβολικὴν αὐτῶν ἱερουργίαν ἔρχεται καὶ τῷ Θεοπαράδότης.
 ὅθεν εὐλαβῶς τε ἅμα καὶ ἱεραρχικῶς μετὰ τῆς ἱερᾶς τῶν θει-
 οργιῶν ὕμνου ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑπὲρ αὐτὸν ἱερουργίας ἀπολογεῖται·
 πρότερον ἱερῶς πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀναβοῶν· σὺ εἶπας· τῷ ποιεῖτε
 εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. εἶτα τῆς Θεομιμήτης ταύτης ἱερουργίας
 ἄξιός αἰτήσας γενέσθαι, καὶ τῇ πρὸς αὐτὸν Χριστὸν ἀφο-
 μιῶσει τὰ Θεῖα τελείσαι καὶ διαδῶναι πανάγνωσ καὶ τῆς τῶν
 ἱερῶν μεθέξοντας ἱεροπρεπῶς μέλασχεῖν, ἱερουργεῖ τὰ Θειώτατα
 καὶ ὑπ' ὅψιν ἄγει τὰ ὑμνημένα διὰ τῶν ἱερῶς προκειμένων
 συμβόλων. τὸν γὰρ ἐγκεκαλυμμένον καὶ ἀδιαίρετον ἄρτον ἀνα-
 καλύψας καὶ εἰς πολλὰ διελὼν καὶ τὸ ἐνιαῖον τῇ ποτηρίᾳ πᾶσι
 καταμερίσας συμβολικῶς τὴν ἐνοτητα πληθύνει καὶ διανέμει
 παναγεσάτην ἐν τέτοις ἱερουργίαις τελῶν.

Those who are chosen for the ministerial
 Garnishing, together with the Priests, put forth
 upon the divine Altar the sacred Bread and
 the Cup of Blessing, when the whole Assen-
 bly of the Church have confessed before, an
 universal Hymn of Praise; then the divine
 Bishop finishes a sacred Prayer, and de-
 clares sacred Peace unto all; and when all
 have saluted each other, then follows the my-
 stical Recitation of the sacred Tables. N. 3.
 §. 7. Some call this Hymn a Song of Praise;
 others

others a Symbol of Worship ; others, I suppose, a hierarchical or more divine Eucharist, as comprehensible of all those sacred Gifts, which are derived to us from God. The whole Affair of celebrating with Hymns all the divine Works of God, seems to me to concern us, to wit, setting up in the other's room our Being and Life in a beautiful Shape, the forming our divine Part in its primitive Beauties, and fixing it in the Participation of a more divine Habit, and Reconciliation, and discerning clearly that we are deprived of the divine Gifts thro' our Negligence ; but that we are by repaired Goods called back to partake of our ancient Purity, and that by a general Receiving of our Friends, we are admitted to a perfect Communication with our Brethren for our Good ; by which means we are admitted to Communion with God, and with the Saints. So §. 12. The divine Bishop standing at the divine Altar, sings the afore-mentioned divine Operations of the most divine Benevolence of Jesus Christ towards us ; which, for the Salvation of our Race, through the Goodwill of the most holy Father, in the Holy Ghost, he, according as it was predestinated, hath perfected ; and having sung the divine Worship which is paid to them, and beheld, with the Eyes of his Mind, this intelligible Theory. Then he proceeds to the symbolical Consecration ; and as appointed divinely,
after

after which, with Reverence, and as it becomes a Bishop, after the sacred Hymns of the divine Works, he makes an Apology to him for himself, for being employed in a Consecration above his Merit, first as a Priest having spoke aloud to him, Thou hast said, do this in Remembrance of me ; then praying that he may be made worthy of this Consecration, done in Imitation of Christ, and to do as he did, to consecrate the divine Gifts, and to distribute them holily ; and that those who partake of them, may communicate in a sacred Manner, he consecrates the most holy Elements, and spreads what he had celebrated with Hymns into View, by the Symbols holily exposed. The Bread covered over and undivided, he uncovers, and divides into many Pieces, and dividing the Unity of the Cup to all symbolically, fulfils and distributes the most holy Union, perfecting thereby the Consecration.

C H A P. II.

*An Historical Account of the Presence
of Christ in the Lord's Supper.*

THE Doctrine of Christ's spiritual Presence at the Eucharist, was ever, and is still believed and confessed by all true Christians; nor do we meet with any thing of his bodily Presence expressly in any of the Fathers, for about five or six hundred Years; from whence it is manifest, that it was never thought of by them: It is very well expressed, in an Italian Distich, mentioned by Dr. *Covel*, in his Account of the *Greek Church*, p. 27, and 28.

*Gli misteri d'Iddio colui vede,
Chi serra gli occhi e crede.*

That Man the Mysteries of God doth see,
Who shuts his Eyes, believing them to be.

Of which he gives us a smart, and ingenious Confutation, in a pleasant Story of the great *Erasmus*, and our famous Sir *Thomas More*: Sir *Thomas* had lent him a Palfry, or Pad Nag, to carry him down to the Sea-side, when he left *England*; *Erasmus* liked him so

Z

well,

well, that he took him on Ship-board, and carried him away with him to *Holland*. They had had many serious Discourses about Christ's Presence in the Eucharist, and *Erasmus*, after his Return thither, thus wittily, in a Letter to him, excuses himself in Monkish Verse for keeping the Horse.

*Quod mihi dixisti
De corpore Christi,
Crede quod edis, & edis;
Sic tibi rescribo,
De tuo palfrido,
Crede quod habes, & habes.*

What of Christ's Body to me,
You said what you did not see,
Believe you receive, you receive it.
I of your Nag say again,
Though with me he still remain,
Believe that you have it, you have it.

By this we may rationally guess, that the bodily Presence of Christ in Heaven, and in the Eucharist, and the Horse's being in *Holland* and *England* at the same Time, were equally overstretched and absurd. About A. D. 700. the Dad of the *Greek* Schoolmen, *John Damascen*, departing from these Expressions of the most primitive Fathers, that there was in the Eucharist an *earthly Part*, the Bread and the Wine, and a heavenly Sanctification, by which they were endowed with a supernatural, and purely spiritual Effect, upon the

Communi-

Communicants, by the divine Operation of the Holy Ghost; either by Mistake, or a mere new Conceit of his own, made two distinct Substances in it, true Bread and Wine, still remaining in the Eucharist; and Christ's divine, or glorified Body and Blood united to them, or coexistent with them. For he, *l. iv. Orthod. Fid. p. 318. c. 14.* compares them to the Coal that touched *Isaiah's* Lips, *Isa. vi. 6.* and saith, as that was not ξύλον λιτόν, plain or common Wood, but Wood united to Fire, so Bread at the Communion is not ἄρτος λιτός, plain Bread, but united, Θεότητι, to Divinity; or, as he calls it a little before, τὸ σῶμα τῆ κυρίου θεωμένον, the Lord's Body deified: Therefore, according to him, the Bread is Bread still, but not common, by reason of its Union with Christ's glorified Body; and a little farther he saith, it is the Body and Blood of Christ, tending to the Constitution, and Support, both of our Soul and Body; not being consumed or corrupted, nor going into the Draught, God forbid, but into our Substance and Conservation, being as a sacred Amulet, Ἀμυντήριον, or Preserver from all Manner of Harm, and a Purge or Cleanser from all Filthiness. So every Creature of God is good, *1 Tim. iv. 4, 5.* But when it is farther sanctified by the Word of God and Prayer, the same God who first made it, can, and does add to it a new Power of working Effects, far above the natural Faculties and Virtues at first given to it at its Creation;

tion; thus it was in the Case of *Daniel* and the three Children, *Dan. i. 12, 13. Prove thy Servants, I beseech thee, ten Days, and let them give us Pulse to eat, and Water to drink. Then let our Countenances be looked upon before thee, and the Countenance of the Children that eat of the Portion of the King's Meat.*

Damascen's Notion being by some of them not so well approved, there was this amazing Fancy proposed and embraced about the next Age, that there were not two distinct Substances in the Eucharist; but that the very Substance of the Bread and Wine were changed, and made the very Substance of the Body and Blood of Christ. And many toping *Papalins*, assert that *Paschasius Rhadbertus* was the Author of it, A. D. 818. See *Covel's Account of the Greek Church*, p. 33. Preface. He was first a Monk, and afterwards Abbot of *Corbey*, but was strongly opposed by *Rabanus Maurus*, Archbishop of *Mentz*, 847.

If we trace this Doctrine, Transubstantiation *, to its original Fountain, we shall find its Rise to have been about the seventh Century. In the Year 754. a Council was summoned by *Constantin Copronymus* and *Leo Augustus*, to meet at *Constantinople*, at which were present the Bishops of the *Greek Church* and Fathers, to the Number of three hundred and thirty-eight: These all decreed, that our Lord left the Eucharist with us, as the true and only

* *Tillotson's Discourse against Transubstantiation.*

only Image delivered by divine Authority, to the End that all other Images, and their Worship, might be excluded.

Afterwards, in the Year 787. or 788. a second Council was called at *Nice*, by *Constantine* and *Irene*; repealed the Decrees of the former Councils, and likewise banished the Use of the Words Image and Antitype, as given to the holy Eucharist: The Words of the Decree are as follow; " It is evidently shewn, that neither our Lord, nor his Apostles, or the Fathers, did any where call the unbloody Sacrifice of the Priest an Image, but the Body itself; indeed before the Consecration is compleated, it pleased some of the holy Fathers reverently to call them Antitypes."

Art. vi. t. 3.

So that the corporeal Prefence of the Body of Christ in the Sacrament was first brought in to support the stupid Worship of Images*; and indeed it could never have come in upon a more proper Occasion, nor have been applied to a fitter Purpose†. *John Damascen* had before asserted, that if any did call the Bread and the Wine Antitypes of the Body and Blood of the Lord, as said Θεοφόρος Βασιλειος, divine

* Of which all the Use in God's Service we find condemned with great Detestation in the holy Scriptures: Exod. xxxii. 7, 8. 20, 21. 1 Kings xii. 30. xiii. 34. Pf. cvi. 19, 20, 21. Deut. iv. 15, 16, 17, 18. Isa. xl. 18, &c. Rom. i. 21. 23. 2 Chron. xxiv. 14.

† Ibid. *Tillotson*, p. 270.

divine *Basil*, they called the Oblation so, not after Consecration, but before Consecration. *J. Damasc. de Fide Orthod. l. iv. c. 14.*

I see not what could have compelled him to say these Words, so directly contrary to historical Truth, as to have given occasion, as he did to them, and to all the *Greeks* who followed him, to be in the same Error, since it is contrary to what himself hath elsewhere said; who so interprets the Word, that it may be applied to the Elements after Consecration. His Words are, Ἀντίτυπα δὲ τῶν μελλόντων λέγονται, ἔχ' ὡς μὴ ὄντα ἀληθῶς σῶμα καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ, We call them Antitypes, or Figures of Things to come, not because they are not truly the Body and Blood of Christ.

So *Meletius Syrigius*, against *Cyril Lucar's* Confession, mentioned by *Dr. Covel* in his History of the Rise and Progress of Transubstantiation, p. 125, 126, hath the Words * Antitype, and Μετασίωσις, Transubstantiation, as having been used by *Genadius*, Patriarch of *Constantinople*, as *Meletius* pretends: Οὐδὲ τύπος ἐστὶν τὸ μουσικὸν τῷ Χριστῷ σῶμα τῷ ἀληθῶς σώματος, ἀλλὰ ἡ ἀλήθεια ἐκείνη τῷ σωματός ἐστιν. ἔ γὰρ τύποις ἔδδ' σκιαῖς νῦν ὡς ἐν τῇ παλαιᾷ ἀλλὰ πράγμασι καὶ ἀληθείας λατρεύομεν. Ἐὰν δὲ τις τῶν ἁγίων ἀντίτυπον λέγει τὴν θυσίαν ταύτην τῷ δεσποτικῷ δείπνῳ ἐκείνῳ, δηλὸν ἐστὶ, ὅτι ἡ θυσία μὲν αὕτη τύπος ἐστὶ τῆς θυσίας ἐκείνης, ὥσπερ καὶ οἱ νῦν
Σύοντες

* *Antitypum*, Ἀντίτυπος, a Copy, like, or contrary to the Pattern.

ῥύοντες τύποι ἐπὶ τῷ ῥύσαντῳ Ἰησοῦ. τὸ δὲ ἀποτέλεσμα τῆς
 ῥυσίας τὸ αὐτὸ ἐστὶ καὶ τότε καὶ νῦν. Ἡ μετεσώσις δηλονότι.

Neither is the mystical Body of Christ a Type of the true Body, but is that Truth of the Body; for now we worship not with Types and Shadows, as of old, but with Things and Truths. But if any of the Saints call this Sacrifice an Antitype of that Supper of our Lord, it is plain, that this Sacrifice is a Type of that Sacrifice; as also they who sacrifice now, are Types of Jesus who sacrificed then; but the Effect, or End, or Design of the Sacrifice the same both then and now, to wit, *Transubstantiation*.

“ First, here seems little less than a plain Contradiction; the mystical Body of Christ is not a Type of the true Body, and yet the whole mystical Sacrifice is a Type of that Sacrifice which Christ made, and the Priests are Types of Christ; but then that is no more the real Body of Christ, of which it is an Antitype, than the Priests are real Christ, whose Types they are. Next, these Words, *to wit, Transubstantiation*, come in so oddly, as, supposing all the Words foregoing were *Gennadius's*, these seem to be a mere Scholion or Note of *Meletius's*, and not his; and they seem added very improperly; for Ἀποτέλεσμα, the Effect, or End, or Design, or (if you please) Perfection of both Sacrifices, relate purely to us, and must be some more divine
 and

and spiritual Thing than Transubstantiation, to wit, Remission of Sins." *

Bessarion, de Sacram. Euch. t. vi. Biblioth. Patrum, p. 470. says, that *Damascen* meant only, that the ancient Fathers believed the Elements after Consecration, were no longer the naked Figure of the Body of Christ, but the very Body of Christ itself; but he certainly was mistaken, for the Dispute is not about the Thing, but the Word; for as to that, he held, that the Bread and Wine are not only joined to, but, παραλαμβάνεται, assumed by the Divinity; which Word is made use of to express the Union of the divine and human Nature in Christ, by the Author of the *Athanasian Creed*, as he writes in his Epistle to *Zacharias* the Bishop of *Doare*, *de Fid. Orthod. l. iv. c. 14.* And to this he adds Augmentation and Increase. But to return:

The second Council of *Nice*, thus in order to establish Image Worship, which was then done and there, laid the Seeds of that Error, which, in the Space of 400 Years, grew up to the monstrous Doctrine of Transubstantiation; and in the Council of *Lateran*, A. D. 1215. under Pope *Innocent III.* it was reduced into an Article of Faith in the Church of *Rome*, and afterwards re-established in the *Trent Council*, A. D. 1551. and at length inserted into Pope *Pius's Creed*. They might justly

* *Dr. Covel* *ibid.*

justly have said, that the sacred Symbols are more than a mere Image, more than mere Signs and Figures; but they should not have denied their being Images at all: They might justly have said with Bishop *Cranmer*; * that Christ and the Holy Ghost be truly and indeed present by their mighty and sanctifying Power, Virtue and Grace, in all them that worthily receive the same; that the Force, the Grace, the Virtue and Benefit of his Body &c. But they ought not to have asserted what they did in that absolute Manner, or in such crude Terms, left without the proper qualifying Explanations; which Doctrine, as this was the first Occasion of introducing it among the *Greeks*, (A. D. 813.) thus far advanced, was the Occasion why *Paschasius Radbertus* carried it farther, in the *Latin* or *Roman* Church, † even to Transubstantiation; of which Doctrine, as now believed by the Church of *Rome*, I shall here give a Definition, or rather a Description, in the Words of *Bosluet*, Bishop of *Meaux*, cited by Mr. *Pfaffius*, p. 226. ‘ Il faut donc entendre ici une espèce
 ‘ de production, du corps, & du sang, dans
 ‘ l’eucharistie aussi veritable, & aussi réelle,
 ‘ que celle que fut faite dans le bien-heureux
 ‘ sein de Marie, au moment de la conception,
 ‘ & de l’incarnation du fils de Dieu; produc-
 ‘ tion

* See p. 193.

† *Tillotson’s* Discourse against Transubstantiation, p. 270, 271.

' tion qui lui donne en quelque façon un
 ' nouvel être, par lequel il est sur la sainte ta-
 ' ble aussi véritablement, qu'il a été dans le
 ' sein de la Vierge & qu'il est maintenant
 ' dans le ciel. C'est pourquoi on se sert ici
 ' du mot de faire, pour marquer une verita-
 ' ble & tres réel action, qui se termine à faire
 ' dans ce saint mystere un vrai corps, d'un vrai
 ' sang, & le même, qui fut fait au sein de Marie.
 Therefore we must understand here a Species
 of Production of the Body and Blood of
 Christ, in the Eucharist, as true and real as
 that was, which was made in the blessed
 Womb of the Virgin *Mary*, the very Moment
 of the Conception and Incarnation of the Son
 of God ; a Production, which gives to it, in
 a certain Manner, a new Being, whereby it is
 as truly upon the holy Table, as it was in the
 Womb of the Virgin, and as it is at present in
 Heaven. Wherefore here they make use of
 the Word *facere*, to make, to demonstrate a
 true and most real Action, which is so termed
 from its making, in that holy Mystery, a
 true Body and true Blood, and the same
 which was made in the Womb of *Mary*.
 ' Nous avons dit, que la consecration est une
 ' espèce de création nouvelle du corps de Je-
 ' sus Christ par le saint esprit ; ce sacre corps
 ' y reçoit un nouvel être, & c'est pour cela
 ' que Saint Pacien, un saint évêque du qua-
 ' trième siècle, celebre par sa doctrine, appel-
 ' loit l'euchariste le renouvellement du corps,
 ' *innovatio*

‘ *innovatio corporis*. Mais ces corps nouvelle-
 ‘ ment produit ne l’est que pour être consume,
 ‘ & pour perdre par ce moien ce nouvel être
 ‘ qu’il a receu; ce qui, est un acte de victime
 ‘ qui se consume elle-même en un certain
 ‘ sens, encore qu’en verité elle demeure tou-
 ‘ jours entiere & toujours vivant.’ We have
 said, that the Consecration is a Species of new
 Creation of the Body of Jesus Christ by the
 holy Spirit, that holy Body receiveth a new
 Creation. And for this Reason St. *Pacianus*,
 a holy Bishop of the fourth Century, called
 the Eucharist an Innovation of the Body: But
 that Body newly produced, is produced for
 no other End, but that it should be consumed;
 and that it might lose by that Means that new
 Being which it hath received; which is the
 Act of a Victim which consumeth itself in a
 certain Sense, although, in the Truth of the
 Matter, it remains always intire, and always
 living.

For the Confutation of which Doctrine we
 reply, that it is contrary

To Scripture,
 To the Principles of Philosophy,
 To natural Sense and Reason,
 To the Nature of a Sacrament;

Nor is there Proof of it in the old Creeds,
 Canons, General Councils, or Writings of the
 ancient Fathers, for six hundred Years after
 Christ; nor is it countenanced by the Service
 of that Church which teacheth it.

First, To the Scripture, which tells us, that Christ sits at the Right-hand of God, *Col. iii. 1. Acts iii. 21.* and calls the Bread and the Cup so after Consecration, *1 Cor. xi. 27, 28.*

2dly, To Philosophy, which teaches us, that a Body can be but in one Place at a Time; but from *that* Doctrine it would follow, that he must be in all the several Places where the Eucharist is administred, and whole in every Piece of Bread.

3dly, To common Sense, which assures us, that the Bread and Wine remain the same they were before Consecration; and if we reject the Evidence of Sense, we could have no Certainty of any Thing being true, nor that even those Miracles are true, which confirm the Truth of Christianity: For a Miracle is only a supernatural Effect evident to Sense.

4thly, It would follow from this Doctrine, that although Christ have but one Body in Heaven, yet he has numberless Bodies upon Earth, which are daily created and annihilated.

5thly, To the Nature of a Sacrament, which consists of a Sign, and the Thing signified: Now if the Bread be changed into the Body, and the Wine into the Blood of Christ, there remains no Sign; that is, if they are changed or transubstantiated into the Things signified. Moreover, it is the known Character of the Eucharist, that it is an unbloody Sacrifice; but if the Laity are supposed to receive the
Blood

Blood of Christ by way of Concomitancy with his Body included therein, and the Priests do really drink the Blood of Christ, in this Sense the Eucharist cannot be esteemed an unbloody Sacrifice.

6thly, There is no Proof in the old Creeds, Canons, or General Councils, for this Doctrine ; and indeed the Testimonies of the ancient Fathers in general are against it.

St. *Chrysostom*, *Ep. ad Cæsar.* says, The Nature of the Bread and Wine is not changed in the Eucharist. *Theodoret* says, They continue in their former Substance, and Figure, and Form. *Gregory Nyssen*, in *Bapt. Christi*, t. ii. p. 802. And this Bread also is in the Beginning but common Bread ; but when the Mystery hath offered it, then it is called, and is the Body of Christ. In the Liturgy ascribed to St. *James*, the Words, Make this Bread the Body of Christ to all those that receive them, shew, that their Substance is not changed, but their being changed from a common to a spiritual Use. *Gregory Nyssen* (*ut supra*) observes the like Change superinduced upon the Oil where-with baptized Persons were anointed, and upon Altars and Priests, by means of this Sanctification, or Separation from a common to a spiritual Use : This Altar, saith he, at which we stand, is in its Nature but ordinary Stone, nothing different from those you tread upon ; but being dedicated to God's Service, is an holy Table, &c. So the mystical Oil, and so
the

the Wine, which are little worth before the Blessing, after the Sanctification of the Spirit have another Kind of Operation: And thus a Priest, who the other day was a vulgar Person, being separated by Blessing, becomes a Guide, a Governor, a Teacher of Piety, &c. and these Things he doth without any Change at all in his Body or Form.

Nor indeed was Transubstantiation so much as thought of, until the eighth and following Centuries, from which Time it grew by degrees, until the Reformation first begun by *Luther*, who taught,

The Lutheran Doctrine] To believe a true, real and substantial, though spiritual Presence, giving, eating and drinking of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament of the Eucharist; which Presence is so ordered, that, according to his Institution, they are united to the Bread and Wine sacramentally, in a manner incomprehensible to us, as Mediums divinely disposed; so that with the Bread and Wine we sacramentally take, eat, and drink, his Body and Blood, spiritually, and by Faith, even with the Mouth, not in a capernaitick, but supernatural, spiritual and heavenly Manner.

Zuinglius threw off this local Presence, but inadvertently, more than through any real Design, neglected the spiritual Presence and Grace, who, with the Figurists, Anabaptists and Socinians, retain the Notion of Signs and Figures.

Basnagius

Basnagius mentions *Zuinglius* to have been the first Reformer, who began to preach against the Abuses of his Church, A. D. 1516. and makes these Remarks on him, that when the Writings of *Luther* were brought into *Switz*, one of the thirteen Cantons of *Helvetia*, or *Switzerland* in *Germany*, he would not read them, but caused them to be distributed among his Disciples, that they might see, how two Men, who had no Communication with each other, agreed in opposing the same Errors; that Pope *Adrian VI.* sent to offer him every Thing in his Power to give, except the Papacy, to restore him to the *Roman* Communion; and that his Doctrine was much the same with that of *Luther*; and that whatever Dispute was between them, it was only about Words and Terms.

A late learned Writer hath observed the same Thing, from Passages taken from the Writings of the principal *Lutherans* and *Zuinglians*; his Words are, "As to the *Lutherans*, *Calvinists*, and other Protestants, however widely they may appear to differ in Words and Names, yet their Ideas seem all to center—The *Calvinists*, for Example, sometimes speak of eating Christ's Body and Blood by Faith, or by the Mind, and yet they seem to understand nothing more, than a kind of moral, virtual, or mystical Union." The Opinion of *Luther* as to this Matter, we have in the *Latin* Treatise of *Puffendorf*, printed A. D.

1695. which I shall here transcribe, as translated by the learned Writer afore-mentioned.

“ Some of the Reformed say, that we must not believe the Bread and Wine to be naked Symbols, but a Communication or Means by which we come into Participation of the Body and Blood of Christ, as *St. Paul* speaks, *1 Cor. x. 16.* But of what sort that Communion or Communication is, whether physical or moral, may be very well gathered from that Place of *St. Paul*: By a physical Communion or Participation must be understood the Conjunction of two Bodies, as of Water and Wine, of Meal and Sugar; but by a moral one is meant such as, when any Thing partakes of the Virtue and Efficacy of another, and in that Respect is accounted the same with the other, or is connected with it.”

This Bread eaten by the Faithful in the Ceremony of this Supper, this Wine also therein drank, by such shall have the same Virtue and Efficacy, as if you should eat the Substance itself of my Body, and drink the very Substance of my Blood: Or this Bread is put instead of the sacrificed Flesh, this Wine instead of the sacrificed Blood.

But as *Dr. Waterland* in his Review observes, “ If both Sides would sincerely profess that there is a Participation of the Benefits by him purchased, all the Controversy remaining is only about the Manner of eating and drinking, and of the Presence of Christ’s Body
and

Blood, which both Sides confess to be above the Reach of human Capacity; and so they make use of Reason, where there is no room for Reason."

Calvin, A. D. 1536. made still a farther Step towards this Reformation, whose Doctrine was, *The Calvin Doctrine*] That the Body of Christ is not truly and really present in the Sacrament, but nevertheless, it is by the Faithful truly and really eaten, neither is it done by Faith only, and a Figure, but by Faith as the Instrument, in very Deed, the Substance of his divine Body is offered, exhibited, communicated to us. Here such a Concomitancy is understood, whereby the Body and Blood of Christ only assist and accompany the Bread and Wine in the external Act of receiving; it is therefore in Construction the same with that of *Luther*.

But Bishop *Cranmer*, in his Book against *Gardiner*, Ed. 1551. taught, " That Christ and the Holy Ghost be truly and indeed present by their mighty and sanctifying Power, Virtue, and Grace, in all them that worthily receive the same: That the Force, the Grace, the Virtue and Benefit of Christ's Body that was crucified for us, and of his Blood that was shed for us, be truly and effectually present with all them that duly receive the Sacrament, agreeable to our Doctrine."

I shall conclude this Chapter with a Passage from Bishop *Burnet*, who tells us, that in the

first Year of Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign, the Queen and Council reformed that Part of the second Liturgy of King *Edward VI.* which seemed to exclude the Belief of any Presence at all: His Words are in the second Part of the History of the Reformation, *p.* 390.

“ A Bull passed for the Uniformity of the Service of the Church; some of the reformed Divines were appointed to review King *Edward's* Liturgy, and to see if in any Particular it was fit to change it. The only considerable Variation was made about the Lord's Supper.

It was proposed to have the Communion-Book so contrived, that it might not exclude the Belief of the corporal Presence; for the chief Design of the Queen's Council was, to unite the Nation in one Faith, and the greatest Part of the Nation continued to believe such a Presence: Therefore it was recommended to the Divines, to see that there should be no express Definition made against it; that so it might lie as a speculative Opinion, not determined, in which every Man was left to the Freedom of his own Mind. Hereupon the Rubrick that explains the Reason for kneeling at the Sacrament, that thereby no Adoration is intended to any corporal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood, because that is only in Heaven, which had been in King *Edward's* Liturgy, was now left out.

And whereas at the Delivery of the Elements, in King *Edward's* first Liturgy, there was to be

be said, The Body or Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy Body and Soul; which Words had been left out in the second Liturgy, as favouring the corporal Presence too much; and instead of them these Words were ordered to be used in the Distribution of the Sacrament, Take, eat this in Remembrance that Christ died for thee.

In the first Year of Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign the old Words were restored, and set before the new Form.

And in the Collection of Articles made in King *Edward's* Reign, to that of the Eucharist there is an Explanation of Christ's Presence in that Sacrament in the following Words.

‘ Christus in cœlum ascendeus, corpori suo
 ‘ immortalitem dedit, naturam non abstulit;
 ‘ humanæ enim naturæ veritatem juxta Scrip-
 ‘ turas perpetuò retinet, quam uno & definito
 ‘ loco esse, & non in multa vel omnia simul
 ‘ loca diffundi oportet.

‘ Quum igitur Christus in cœlum sublatus,
 ‘ ibi usque, ad finem sæculi sit permanfurus,
 ‘ atque inde, non aliunde (ut loquitur Au-
 ‘ gustinus) venturus sit ad judicandum vivos &
 ‘ mortuos; non debet quisquam fidelium,
 ‘ carnis ejus & sanguinis realem & corpora-
 ‘ lem (ut loquuntur) presentiam in eucharistia
 ‘ vel credere vel profiteri.’

Christ ascending into Heaven, gave Immortality to his Body, but took not away its Nature; for he for ever retains the Truth of the

human Nature, according to the Scriptures, which must be in one and in a distinct Place, and not be dispersed into many, or into all.

When therefore Christ being carried into Heaven, is there to remain unto the End of the World, and from thence, and not from another Place, (as St. *Austin* speaks) will come to judge the Quick and the Dead, none of the Faithful ought either to believe or profess, that either the real or corporal Presence (as they speak) of his Flesh and Blood is in the holy Eucharist."

Briefly, the Twenty-eighth Article is,

We believe that in the Lord's Supper are given, taken, received, and eaten, the Body and Blood of Christ, verily and indeed by Faith, *i. e.* in a spiritual, not a corporal Sense, in their Virtue, Power, and Effect upon the Communicants, so that by thankfully commemorating therein his Sacrifice offered upon the Cross, joined with Repentance, Faith, and Charity, we are Partakers of the Benefits of that Sacrifice.

C H A P. III.

The Ebionites, Cerinthians, Visionaries, Valentinian Gnosticks, and Marcionites, are confuted by this Doctrine.

THE two former of these, as St. Ignatius tells us, denied our Saviour's Divinity; and (*Ep. ad Smyrn. c. 7. p. 4.*) abstained both from the Eucharist and the Prayers, because they would not confess, that the Eucharist was the Flesh and Blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ: And the *Valentinian Gnosticks* absolutely rejected the Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body from the Dead. But this Doctrine being an evident Proof, both of the real Humanity of Christ, and of that spiritual, vital and substantial Union, which is between him and all worthy Partakers of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, it was strongly urged by the ancient Fathers, as an Argument of the Resurrection of all good Men from the Dead; by Virtue of that Union with the Body of Christ being made, as the Apostle speaks, *Eph. v. 30. Members of his Body, of his Flesh, and of his Bones*, by a due Parti-

Participation of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

All these Heresies do very nearly border, and are almost necessarily consequent upon each other : For if our Lord did not assume real Flesh and Blood, but in Appearance only; if he is to be considered only as a walking Phantom or Apparition, according to the Opinion of the *Visionaries* and *Marcionites*, they could not believe that Christ died ; and if he did not die, he could not rise again, nor could Bodies symbolically fed with his, according to the Doctrine of the Eucharist, and incorporated with his glorified Body, be raised again at the Resurrection ; so there could be no Resurrection at all, according to the Opinion of the *Valentinian Gnosticks*.

Against the *Marcionites*, who denied our Saviour's Humanity, *Tertullian* says, *lib. iv. c. 40. p. 458.* ' Acceptum panem, & distributum discipulis, corpus illum suum fecit, hoc est corpus meum dicendo ; id est, figura corporis mei ; figura autem non fuisset, nisi veritatis esset corpus ; ceterum vacua res quod est phantasma, figuram capere non posset : ' Taking Bread, and distributing it to his Disciples, he made it his Body in saying, This is my Body, *i. e.* the Figure of my Body ; but it could not have been the Figure, except his Body had been a true Body ; but a Phantom is an empty Thing, that can have no Figure.

Justin

Justin Martyr says, Ap. i. p. 96. Οὐ γὰρ ὡς κοινὸν ἄρτον, εἰδὲ κοινὸν πόμα ταῦτα λαμβάνομεν, ἀλλὰ τὴν δι' εὐχῆς--εὐχαρισθηῖσαν τροφὴν--ἐκείνῃ τῇ σαρκοποιηθέντος Ἰησοῦ καὶ Σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ἐδιδάχθημεν εἶναι. We do not receive these as common Bread and common Wine, but we are taught, that Food blessed by Prayer and Thanksgiving is the Flesh and Blood of Jesus Christ made Flesh. *Clem. Alex.* Ὁ ζῶν ἄρτος ὁ ὑπὸ τῇ πατρὸς δοθεὶς, ὁ υἱὸς ἐστίν, τοῖς ἐσθίειν βελομένοις. ὁ δὲ ἄρτος ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω, φησὶν ἡ ΣΑΡΞ μὲ ἐστίν. ἥτοι ᾧ τρέφεται ἡ σὰρξ διὰ τῆς εὐχαριστίας. The living Bread, which is given by the Father, is the Son, to those who will eat of it; but the Bread which I will give, says he, is my Flesh, or by which the Flesh is nourished by the Eucharist, or Thanksgiving.

The Argument which the Christian Fathers made use of in Reply to the Heresies of the *Valentinian Gnosticks*, who opposed the future Resurrection of the Just, was, that as the Bodies of the Faithful are symbolically fed with the Body of Christ, and so are united to it, they must of course be Partakers with it of a glorious Resurrection, as the Branches partake of the Vine, and the Members of the Head.

Irenæus endeavouring to convince them, who agreed with the orthodox Christians as to external Profession and Worship, that there is an Union and Communion between them and the true Body of our Lord, by our partaking of the Eucharist; "We declare, says he, in Congruity thereto, that we have Fellowship
with

with him, and are united to him *, and profess the Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Flesh, and the Spirit of Christ, in the Eucharist;” blaming them, that although they acknowledged the former, yet they denied a Doctrine which is the necessary Consequence thereof.

The *Gnosticks* real Opinion was, that the supreme Father and the Demiurgus were different Beings, that the supreme Christ, the Son of the former, was impassible, and did not assume to himself human Flesh, but celestial Flesh only, and which did only pass through the Womb of the Virgin; that there was an inferior Christ distinct from the other, the Son of the Creator of the World, a mere Man, as they feigned him to be, whose Body and Blood are received in the Eucharist. And the *Ebionites* and *Cerinthians*, who adopted their Notions, could not comprehend it to be the Flesh and Blood of the only-begotten Word and Son of God, and therefore abstained both from the Eucharist and Prayer. For this Reason the holy Martyr St. *Ignatius* grievously reproaches them, and teaches, that others ought to shun all Communion with them; his Words are, † *Εὐχαριστίας καὶ προσευχῆς ἀπέχονται διὰ τὸ μὴ ὁμολογεῖν τὴν εὐχαριστίαν σάρκα εἶναι τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὴν ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν παθῆσαν, ἣν τῇ χρηστότητι ὁ πατὴρ ἡγείρεν.* They abstain from the Eucharist

* Ep. ad Smyr. §. 7.

† Pfaff. Not. in S. Iren. p. 64, 65.

rists and Prayer, because they do not confess, that the Eucharist is the Flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who suffered for our Sins, whom the Father of his Goodness raised; they therefore contradicting the Gift of God, as they desire shall perish, it is meet to abstain from such.

And *Irenæus* confutes the former by a very demonstrative Argument, according to St. *Paul's* Doctrine, *Rom. viii. 11.*

“Ὅτι μέλη ἐσμὲν τοῦ σώματος, ἐκτῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ περὶ πνευματικῆς τινὸς λέγων ταῦτα [τὸ γὰρ πνεῦμα ἔτε ὁσέα, ἔτε σάρκα ἔχει] ἀλλὰ περὶ τῆς κατὰ τον ἀληθινὸν ἀνθρώπου οἰκονομίας, τῆς ἐκ σαρκὸς καὶ νεύρων συνενώσεως, ἥτις καὶ ἐκτὸς ποτηρίᾳ αὐτοῦ. ὃ ἐστὶ τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ τρέφεται, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἄρτου ὃ ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ αὐξεται. καὶ ὅνπερ τρόπον τὸ ξύλον τῆς ἀμπέλης ἐκλιθεὶς εἰς τὴν γῆν τῷ ἰδίῳ καιρῷ ἐκαρποφόρησε καὶ ὁ κόκκος τοῦ σίτου πεσὼν εἰς τὴν γῆν καὶ διαλυθεὶς πολλοὺς ἐγέρθη διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ Θεοῦ συνέχοντος τὰ πάντα. ἔπειτα δὲ διὰ τῆς σοφίας τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰς χρῆσιν ἐλθόντα ἀνθρώπων καὶ προσλαμβανόμενα τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ εὐχαριστία γίνεται, ὅπερ ἐστὶ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ. ἕτως καὶ τὰ ἡμέτερα σώματα ἐκ αὐτῆς τρεφόμενα καὶ τεθέντα εἰς τὴν γῆν καὶ διαλυθέντα ἐν αὐτῇ ἀναστήσεται ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ καιρῷ, τοῦ λόγου τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν ἐγερσιν αὐτοῖς χαρίζομένης εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς.

That we are Members of the Body and of his Flesh; he says not this of any spiritual Substance, [for a Spirit hath not Flesh and Bones] but concerning the true Dispensation of the human Frame, consisting of Flesh and Nerves, and which is nourished by that Cup which is his Blood, and increased by that Bread which

is his Body: And in the same Manner, that a Stock of a Vine bent into the Earth, in its due Season beareth Fruit, and a Grain of Wheat falling upon the Earth, and dissolved, riseth again manifold, by the Spirit of God that comprehends all Things; but afterwards, by the Wisdom of God, become fit for the Use of Men; and receiving the Word of God, become the Eucharist, which is the Body and Blood of Christ; so our Bodies, being nourished by it, and put into the Earth, and dissolved therein, in due Season will be raised again †.

St. *Athanasius* afterwards made use of the same Argument; his Words are as follow: Ἀ γὰρ λελάληκα φησὶν ὑμῖν πνεῦμα ἐστὶ καὶ ζωὴ. ἴσον τῷ εἰπεῖν, τὸ μὲν δεικνύμενον καὶ διδόμενον ὑπὲρ τῆς τῆ κόσμου σωτηρίας, ἐστὶν ἡ σαρξ ἣν ἐγὼ φορῶ. ἀλλ' αὕτη ὑμῖν. καὶ τὸ ταύτης αἷμα παρ' ἐμὲ πνευματικῶς δοθήσεται τροφή. ὥστε πνευματικῶς ἐν ἐκάστω ταύτην ἀναδίδοσθαι, καὶ γίνεσθαι πᾶσι φυλακτήριον εἰς ἀνασσοῖν ζωῆς αἰωνίης. He saith, the Words that I have spoken unto you, they are Spirit and Life, which is of equal Import to saying, that which is exhibited and given for the Salvation of the World, is the Flesh that I carry; but that and the Blood of it shall by me be given spiritually for Food; so that it shall be in every one given spiritually, and shall be to all Men a Security for the Resurrection to eternal Life *.

† *Irenæus*, lib. v. c. 2. p. 398, 399.

* *Athen.* Ep. ad Se. p. 110.

Their other Error *Irenæus* confutes by telling them, that Christ gave Thanks to the Father when he celebrated the Eucharist for his Creatures; therefore they must be the Creatures of the Father of Christ, and the Creator of the World.

* The *Lutherans* suppose it impossible that, according to *Irenæus's* Argument, our Bodies should be fed with the Body of our Lord, which they suppose to be locally present, and therefore communicated both to Good and Bad promiscuously. Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist, p. 223, 224, 225. Understanding here by *Irenæus's* Doctrine a supernatural Nourishment, transcending the Thoughts of any gross, natural Food, being a Feeding upon the Flesh and Blood of our Lord's glorified Body; the Reason, Manner and Excellence of which, is unknown to us; whereas the Body we receive in this holy Sacrament, is Christ's crucified Body, and his Blood shed for us; not that which is in Heaven, but that which he then had, whereby we are united to his glorified Body. See p. 193.

Irenæus, advers. Hære. lib. i. cap. 13. §. 5.

Προσφέρομεν δὲ αὐτῷ τὰ ἴδια, ἐμμελῶς κοινωνίαν καὶ ἑνώσιν ἀπαγγέλλοντες καὶ ὁμολογῦντες σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος ἐγερσιν. ὡς γὰρ ἀπὸ γῆς ἄρτος προσλαμβανόμενος τὴν ἑκκλησίαν τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ ἔτι κοινὸς ἄρτος ἐστὶν ἀλλ' εὐχαριστία, ἐκ δύο πραγ-

C c 2

μάτων

* *Pfaffius*, Not. in S. Iren. Fragm. Anecd. p. 72, 73, 84.

μάτων συνεσηκῦα ἐπιγείῃ τε καὶ * ἑρρανίῃ, ὥπως καὶ τὰ σώματα
ἡμῶν μεταλαμβάνοντα τῆς εὐχαριστίας μηκέτι εἰσὶ φάρμακα,
τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς εἰς αἰῶνα ἀνασάσεως ἔχοντα.

Here he first refutes those who denied the Humanity of our Lord, and that he was the Son of the Creator of the World: For we offer to him his own Things, [created by him, as Christ did; he therefore is the Son of the Creator, or he must have been covetous of what is another's; then says he elsewhere, neither is the Cup the Communion of his Blood, nor the Bread which we break the Communion of his Body] agreeably declaring the Union and Communion, *i. e.* between Christ and the Faithful; and confessing the Power of the Flesh to rise up again and be revived, and of the Spirit of Christ in the Eucharist; for as the terrestrial Bread, receiving Invocation of God, is no longer common Bread, but the Eucharist, consisting of two Things, a terrestrial and celestial; whereby they are endowed with all the Grace, Virtue, and

* *The true and substantial Body and Blood of Christ*; so the *Lutherans* construe this Word; therefore, as they understand this as a Presence of his glorified Body in the Eucharist, and the Communion to be between that and the terrene Part, cannot conceive how our Bodies can be fed with the Body of Christ therein, or the Resurrection thence proved against the *Gnosticks*; (*Pfaffius*, Not. in *S. Iren.* p. 72, 73.) whereas we understand the terrene Part to be only a Communication, or Means whereby we come into Participation of the Body and Blood of Christ; (see p. 192.) and therefore that all true Believers shall be Partakers of his Resurrection.

and Benefit of Christ's Body and Blood, to those who worthily and with Faith receive the same; so our Bodies receiving the Eucharist, and being united to him, are no longer corruptible, having the Hope of the Resurrection to eternal Life, which the *Gnosticks* denied.

Therefore these Hereticks were exhorted, by the same *Irenæus*, ἢ τὴν γνώμην ἀλλεξάτωσαν, ἢ τὸ προσφέρειν τὰ ἐρημένα παρακτείσδωσαν, either to change their Doctrine, or to come no more to the holy Sacrament; since they asserted a Doctrine directly contradictory to that of the blessed Apostle St. *John*, Chap. vi. 54, 55. How can they say, saith he, that this Flesh will be destroyed, and will not partake of Life, since it hath been nourished by the Body and Blood of our Lord; therefore, says he, either let them change their Doctrine, or come no more to the Eucharist: Ἡμῶν δὲ σύμφωνος ἡ γνώμη τῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ, καὶ ἡ εὐχαριστία βεβαιεῖ τὴν γνώμην, As for our Doctrine, it agrees with our Eucharist, and our Eucharist confirms our Doctrine.

* Mr. *Pfaffius* objects againsts this Reasoning of St. *Irenæus*, that the Connexion of his Propositions does not seem wholly firm, and he thinks it is not explained, how the Body and Blood of our Lord can nourish our Flesh unto the Resurrection to eternal Life; but his Scruple had been removed, if he had considered *Irenæus* here as writing according to the Doctrine

trine of Christ himself, *John* vi. 63. that God's holy Spirit giving Virtue and Energy to what we eat and drink in the Eucharist; that Meat and Drink are his Body and Blood in a spiritual Sense, and by spiritual Benefit and Influence, and are therefore discerned to be so by Faith; and we are by being Partakers thereof, considered as fed with his real Body; the spiritual Benefits whereof are our Union with him and Resurrection to eternal Life with Christ our Head. But admitting, as he replies, that Christ (*John* vi. 44, 45.) could not have spoke in particular concerning this Sacrament, but was only enforcing spiritual Manducation by Faith; yet, if worthy Receivers of the Eucharist are doing a Duty signified by the Expressions, *John* vi. 44, 45, &c. if they in that Sacrament spiritually feed on Christ's Flesh and Blood by Faith, then they prove the Truth of *Irenæus's* Doctrine.

C H A P. IV.

*A Vindication of the Twenty-fifth and
Thirty-third Articles of Religion.*

[*In which is proved, that Repentance and Confession of Sin to God only are necessary, and that Penance, which the Church of Rome calls a Sacrament, ought not to be accounted such; and that Attrition, without Contrition joined with it, is not sufficient for the Pardon of Mens Sins, and their obtaining eternal Salvation. Art. xxxiii. That the Power to cast out of, or let into the Church, is in the Hands of the whole Assembly of Christians, or the Prelates and Governors of it, not in the Priest.*]

THE Direction of our Church, in relation to Confession and Remission of Sins, is, that we should examine our Lives and Conversations by the Rule of God's Commandments, and wherein soever we shall perceive ourselves to have offended, either by Will, Word, or Deed, there to bewail our own Sinfulness, and to confess ourselves to Almighty God,

God, with full Purpose of Amendment of Life: And if ye shall perceive your Offences to be such as are not only against God, but against your Neighbours, then ye shall reconcile yourselves unto them, &c. This is true Scripture Doctrine.

I said, I will confess my Sins unto the Lord; and so thou forgavest the Wickedness of my Sin, says the Royal Prophet: On the contrary, the Doctors of the Church of Rome tell us, that instead of confessing our Sins to Almighty God, we must make * auricular or private Confession of every particular Sin that we have committed, to the Priest, with every Circumstance of it, in order to the obtaining of Pardon or Absolution from him, without which, say they, no Sin can be pardoned; that this is sufficient for the Pardon of our Sins, and obtaining eternal Salvation.

Their Doctrine upon that Head is in Substance as follows: " Since our Contrition, say they, ought to be so vehement and severe, as that the Bitterness of our Grief should be equal to the Heinousness of our Sin; and since few arrive at this Height, and by consequence very few can hope for Pardon of their Sins this Way; it was necessary that the merciful God should consult the Salvation of Man by an easier † Manner; which truly, by admirable Council,

* Council Trent, sess. xiv. ch. 4.

† Roman Catech. p. 223, &c. Ed. Antw. Bull's Sermons, vol. i. p. 14.

Council, he hath effected, when he gave to the Church the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven ;” which Doctrine they endeavour to prove from the Texts here cited.

Mat. xvi. 19. I will give unto thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven.

Mat. xviii. 18. Verily I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on Earth, shall be bound in Heaven ; and whatsoever ye shall loose on Earth, shall be loosed in Heaven.

John xx. 23, 24. Whosoever Sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them ; and whosoever Sins ye retain, they are retained. But *Thomas*, one of the Twelve, called *Didimus*, was not with them when Jesus came.

Mat. xxviii. 19. Go ye therefore, and teach, &c.

This indeed, as that Church hath ordered it, is a much easier Way than what the Scripture prescribes : If we find it irksome to be always in the Bitterness of our Soul, we may go to the Priest and compound the Business ; we may commute the Torments and Pangs of the Soul for a little mortifying and chastizing of the Body, or for emptying the Purse, which, when it is often very slightly done, as the Priest enjoins it, all account to that Day will be even ; and we may presently begin upon a new Score : Though our Sorrow be not much for Sin, yet, by the Power of the Keys, all our Sins are forgiven upon Confession to the Priest. Strange, bewitching Doctrine ! which

has given the greatest Encouragement to Lewdness and Debauchery imaginable. For, at this Rate, who would be terrified in Conscience at the greatest of Crimes; if he can escape human Punishment, and can pay the Priest well for it, he need not put himself to the Trouble of being very sorrowful in Heart for it.

By this so dangerous, so presumptuous an Error, they usurp upon the Prerogative of God, (*Mark ii. 7.*) and likewise lay a dangerous Stumbling-block in the Way of wicked Men, whilst they encourage them to rely on such a Sorrow for the Forgiveness of their Sins, as will certainly fail, and ruin them in the End; whilst by the Absolution, which is so readily given them upon Confession, and the Efficacy of which is so highly magnified in that Church, they are taught to entertain a much less Opinion of the Heinousness of their evil Doings, than either the Scripture warrants, or their own Interest should prompt them to admit of; as it is a great Rack and Snare to the Consciences of good Men.

But Christ, when he gave to the Apostles, and in them to their Successors, Power to remit and retain Sins, meant only, that they should give his Word and faithful Promise for it to all the World, upon certain Conditions; that they should declare to Men, who are bound to, and who are loosed from their Sins, and by preaching his infallible Word turn them from Darkness to Light, &c.

This

This was the Business of Christ, to give Promise of Forgiveness to all who should repent and believe his Gospel: As his Father sent him, so sent he them, saying, *Mark* xvi. 15, 16. Go ye into all the World, and preach the Gospel to every Creature; he that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved, &c. So we find it joined with the Command of Repentance, Repent, and be baptized.

These were the Methods in which the Apostles remitted or retained Sins; so St. Paul remitted the Sins of the mixed Multitude at *Antioch*, *Acts* xiii. 38, &c.

So of *Lydia*, when she believed, and was baptized, and her whole Household, *Acts* xvi. 14, 15. and 31, 33.

So he and *Sylas* remitted the Sins of the Gaoler for the same Reason.

Again, *Paul* and *Barnabas* retained the Sins of *Elymas* the Sorcerer, *Acts* xiii. 8, 9.

And of the obstinate *Jews*, who stirred up the devout and honourable Women, and the chief Men of the City, and raised Persecution against them, and expelled them out of their Coasts; they, as Christ commanded, shook off the Dust of their Feet against them, and left their Sins retained to this Day.

Christ gave no Man the Power of remitting or retaining Sins by his own private Authority, which is the sole Prerogative of God, *Mark* ii. 7. *Job* xiv. 4. *Psal.* cxxx. 4. *Isai.* xliii. 25.

St. *Chrysostom*, *Hom.* ii. *Pf.* li. speaking upon this Subject, says, " But perhaps thou mayest be ashamed to speak, because thou hast sinned; tell them (*i. e.* thy Sins) every Day in thy Prayer; and why so? do I say, tell them to a Fellow-servant, who may upbraid thee; tell them to God, who cures them."

A Jesuit or Priest would reply to this, to what Purpose are the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven given, to cast out of, or let into the Church, if they have not (*i. e.* Priests) Power to remit or retain Sins? I answer, that the whole Church, or Assembly of Christians, † or the Prelates and Governors of it, can, and ought to censure, and if Need be, to excommunicate all publick, scandalous Sinners, to give them some publick Mark of Disgrace and Reproof, or turn them out of the Christian Congregation, and upon their humble Submission and solemn Renunciation of their Extravagancies, or upon their publick Expressions of their sincere Repentance, to restore them to their former State *; and this will appear

† 1 Cor. v. 4, 5. Comp. *Ignat. Ep. ad Smyrn.* §. 8. with *Mat.* xviii. 17.

* Article of Religion, xxxiii.

* This Discipline was strictly observed, particularly with regard to Communicants at the Lord's Supper, in the Primitive Church, as we are told by Dr. *Comber*, in his *Companion to the Altar*, p. 205.

He must be a great Stranger to the Discipline of that Church, who knows not how great Care was taken, that

appear from the following plain Texts of Scripture.

2 *Theff.* iii. 14. And if any Man obey not our Word by this Epistle, note that Man, and have no Company with him, that he may be ashamed.

Mat. xviii. 17. He that neglects to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an Heathen.

that no publick Offender might partake of these Mysteries, until by a long Trial, and a great Humiliation, he had received an Absolution, as publick as his Crime had been. It was reckoned a scandalous Irregularity in *St. Cyprian's* Time, that 'Nondum poenitentia acta, nondum exhomologesi facta, nondum manu eis ab episcopo & clero imposita eucharistia eis datur;' Not having repented and confessed their Sins, without Imposition of Hands by the Bishop and Clergy, the Eucharist is given to lapsed Persons; which yet was afterwards rectified, as *St. Ambrose* says, 'Ubique mysterii ordo servatur, ut prius per remissionem vulneribus medicina tribuatur, postea alimonia mensæ cœlestis exuberet;' Every where the Order of this Mystery is observed, that first by Remission a Medicine should be applied to their Wounds, and that afterwards the Nourishment of the cœlestial Table should abound.

And from the Canons of the Council of *Ancyra* and *Nice*, one held A. D. 315, the other 324. we learn, that the Discipline with regard to receiving Penitents to the Communion, was settled upon a Distinction of them into several Classes, according to the Degrees of their Guilt, and different Signs of their Penitence; and that agreeably thereunto, they were allowed to join some of them in more, others in fewer Parts of the publick Worship, for a long Time, even for Years, before they were judged worthy to partake of the Lord's Supper. See Council of *Anc.* Can. 4, 5, 6. Council of *Nice*, Can. 11.

Mat.

Mat. xviii. 18. Verily I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on Earth, shall be bound in Heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on Earth, shall be loosed in Heaven; *i. e.* by the Church are here meant the Presidents, Bishops and Rulers of it, or else the whole Society and Meeting of Christians together, not every particular Priest *.

So in another Place it was said, If thy Brother trespass against thee, tell him his Fault between thee and him alone; if he neglect to hear thee, tell it to the Church, which if he will not hear, let him be, &c. The Case here meant is of private Injuries done by one to another; but may be extended to all publick Sins whatsoever against God; for if the Church might excommunicate for such Offences, much more for scandalous Sins against God.

I do not deny, but that it is the Duty, sometimes, of illiterate Persons to apply to the † Minister of God's Word for his Advice; and

* See the Note p. 212, 213.

† We direct all Men always to confess to God, but some also to confess their Faults and reveal their Doubts to the Priest, especially in these three Cases.

First, When we are disquieted with the Guilt of some Sin already committed. Or,

Secondly, When we cannot conquer some Lust or Passion. Or,

Thirdly, When we are affected with any intricate Scruples, particularly whether we may now be fit to receive this Sacrament, or no.

If any of these be our Case; then, first, we must chuse prudently, preferring our own Minister, if he be tolerably

and our Church expressly enjoins it in these Words; " If there be any of you, who by this Means, cannot quiet his own Conscience herein, but requireth further Comfort or Counsel, let him come to some discrete and learned Minister of God's Word, and open his Grief, that by the Ministry of God's holy Word, he may receive the Benefit of Absolution, &c." *i. e.* If what he has heard in publick Sermons and Discourses, as to his Qualifications for a worthy Communicant, be not satisfactory to him, he is to apply to the Minister for the Help of his Infirmities concerning

bly fitted, or else we may select another, that is prudent and pious, learned and judicious, one who may manage this weighty Concern gravely and prudently, and dispatch it wisely, and fully to our Satisfaction. 2dly, Let us deal sincerely, and open our Grief to him fully and impartially. Let not Fear or Shame stop our Mouths; for if the Minister be pious, he will be secret and compassionate; if he be discreet, he will discover, whether it be an heavy Guilt or a slight Repentance, Love of Sin or a strong Temptation, Fear or Scruple, that hath occasioned this Trouble. And, 3dly, he hath Threatnings and Promises, Instructions and Directions, out of God's Word, which being dextrously applied, and diligently administered, may be a perfect Cure: If the Conscience be wounded with Guilt, he hath Power from Christ, upon our Contrition, to give Absolution: If it be the Fury of Passion, or the Violence of Temptation, his Piety and Experience hath Store of Counsel for the effectual suppressing thereof: If it be Doubts and Fears, his Learning and Judgment affordeth sufficient Comfort and Satisfaction, through the Blessing of Almighty God. The Scripture commands such Confession, *James v. 16. Comber's Comp. to the Temple, Par. iii. §. 8. p. 61.*

ing the Nature and Heinousness of Sins in general; or Trouble which may arise from the Thoughts of some worldly Crosses and Disappointments; lest, as the Apostle says, *2 Cor. ii. 7.* he be swallowed up with over-much Sorrow; or for the Assistance of his Prayers, or for Absolution, or for the Acknowledgment of Enormities of which he may be publicly known to be guilty; lest others should take Offence; and in a Word, for ghostly Counsel, and friendly Advice in general. But as for private Sins, which are not known to the World, they are to be confessed to God only; no Man can be ignorant if he be wicked, and in what Instances; and if he would he cannot hide it from God; whether you confess to him or not he knows them; to him therefore you are to confess, to examine yourselves, to prove yourselves, according to *St. Paul's* Direction, *1 Cor. xi. 28.*

* “Christ has left with his Church a ministerial Power, to declare Forgiveness of Sins to all such as truly repent of them, and believe in him, for their Comfort, or to declare them retained to the Impenitent for their Correction. And when the Ministers of his Word are called in to the Assistance of the Sick, or scrupulous Persons, they may upon the Supposition of a true Repentance, pronounce, in God's Name, the Pardon of their Sins to them: But
in

* Archbishop *Wake's* Principles of the Christ. Religion EXPLAINED, p. 70.

in this they only deliver the Sentence of God, which, if the Sinner be truly penitent, God will infallibly make good; ctherwise, it will be of no Use to them. It may be replied, Is not this Confession to the Priest therefore necessary for the Penitent, in order to Forgiveness?" I answer, no. Indeed if a true Penitent receive Absolution from his Minister, God ratifies the Sentence, and forgives the Sin. But so God would have done, had neither any Confession been made to, or Absolution received from him: And that the Sin is forgiven, is owing to the Mercy of God, upon the Repentance of the Sinner, and not to be ascribed to the Priest's Sentence. It is therefore a great Error in the Church of *Rome*, to make Penance, *i. e.* Auricular Confession and Absolution necessary, and call it a Sacrament. For Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only Badges, or Tokens of Christian Mens Profession; but they be rather certain sure Witnessees and effectual Signs of Grace, and God's good Will towards us; by the which, he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our Faith in him. But Penance has neither any outward Sign instituted by Christ, nor any inward Grace particularly annexed to it.

A P P E N D I X.

A Short Account of the Judgment of the Fathers concerning modern Controversies.

OUR Controversies concerning the holy Eucharist having not sprung up in the Times of the Fathers, they have wrote nothing expressly of them; so that we are not to think it strange, that they have not given their Sense clearly of them, but have sometimes inclined to one, and sometimes to another Opinion; so that nothing decisive can be concluded from some of their Books.

Tertullian, in his fourth Book against *Marcion* the Heretick, who denied the Humanity of our Lord, but asserted that he was a mere Phantom, and suffered in Appearance only, says, *cap. 40.* ‘Acceptum panem & distributum discipulis, corpus suum illum fecit, hoc est corpus meum dicendo, id est, figura corporis mei:’ He took Bread, and distributing it to his Disciples, made it his Body in saying, This is my Body; which the Divines of the Church of *Rome* cite in Proof of Transubstantiation. This was certainly a very clear Argument to prove from the holy Eucharist the Truth of Christ’s Body, because, a Figure must

must suppose the Truth of the Thing figured. But indeed no more can be collected from thence, either for or against the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, than may from the Words of the Institution ; but in the Words following, that is, a Figure of my Body, he expressly asserts a Figure.

St. *Hierom*, in his Apology against *Rufinus*, says, ‘ Fieri potest, ut vel simpliciter erraverint scriptores ecclesiastici, vel alio sensu scripserint, vel à librariis imperitis eorum paulatim scripta corrupta sint, vel certè antequam in Alexandria quasi dominium meridianum Arrius nanscisceretur, innocenter quædam & minus cautè locuti sunt, quæ non possunt perversorum hominum calumniam declinare.’ It may be, that the ecclesiastical Writers either simply have erred, or else wrote in another Sense, or their Writings by unskilful Librarians have been corrupted, or before that in *Alexandria*, *Arrius* had gained the Meridian Empire, they spoke some Things innocently, and with less Caution, which cannot avoid the Calumny of perverse Men.

To the same Purpose are the Words of the ingenious Mons. *St. Evremond*, *Oeuvres Mêlées*, tom. iv. *Epist. ad Justellum*, p. 158. ‘ Une partie des pères s’est attachée au sens literal de ces paroles, Ceci est mon corps ; l’autre les a prises au sens figure, dans un país où l’on parloit presque toujours par figure. La verité de ce que je dis, se prouve tres-claire-

' ment par les livres des M. Arnauld & M.
 ' Claude, où quand Arnauld allegue un passage
 ' de quelque père, tout l'esprit & la dextérité
 ' de M. Claude suffisent à peine pour l'eluder,
 ' & lorsque ce dernier en cite un autre avan-
 ' tageux à son opinion, toute la force & la ve-
 ' hement de M. Arnauld ne renversent point
 ' l'argument de M. Claude. Cette différence
 ' de sentimens dans les pères est manifeste, il
 ' ne faut qu'avoir un peu de sens pour le con-
 ' noître, & un peu de sincérité pour l'avouer.

One Part of the Fathers is attached to the li-
 teral Sense of these Words, This is my Body ;
 the other have taken them in the figurative
 Sense, according to that Country where they
 speak almost all by a Figure. The Truth of
 that which I say, is proved very clearly by the
 Books of M. *Arnauld* and M. *Claude*, where,
 when M. *Arnauld* alledgeth a Passage of any
 Father, all the Vigour and Dexterity of M.
Claude is the Fruit of his Labour to elude it ;
 and when the latter cites another advanta-
 geous Passage for his Opinion, all the Force
 and Vehemence of M. *Arnauld* cannot confute
 the Argument of M. *Claude*. This Difference
 of Sentiments in the Fathers is manifest, if one
 have but a small Share of Sense to know, and
 of Sincerity to assert it.

To the same Purport are the Words of *Pet.*
Bæ. cited by Mr. *Pfaffius*, p. 473. ' Les
 ' pères ont parlé si diversément de l'eucharistie,
 ' qu'on pourroit comparer leurs expressions
 ' aux

‘ aux phénomènes celestes, cette partie de la
 ‘ physique est celle, qu’on met le plus en
 ‘ parti, & qu’on abandonne le plus aux sup-
 ‘ positions de l’esprit humain. Combien de
 ‘ systemes ne fait-on pas pour donner raison
 ‘ de ces apparences ? ce qu’il y a de rare, c’est,
 ‘ qu’on en vient à but dans toutes, les hypo-
 ‘ thèses, de sorte que la différence des unes
 ‘ aux autres ne consiste que dans le plus ou
 ‘ moins d’embarras. La doctrine des pères
 ‘ sur l’eucharistie a eu le même destin. On
 ‘ n’en connoît que les phénomènes, c’est-à-dire,
 ‘ que les phrases différentes, qu’ils nous ont
 ‘ laissées dans leurs livres. La question est de
 ‘ bien trouver la pensée qui repose sous ces
 ‘ expressions ; pour cela il faut aller en parti,
 ‘ & forger des hypothèses, la transubstantia-
 ‘ tion en est une, l’impanation en est une
 ‘ autre, la figure y entre aussi ; & l’on trouve
 ‘ moyen par tous ces differens systemes pourvû
 ‘ que l’on ait de l’erudition & du genie, de
 ‘ donner raison de toutes les apparences. On
 ‘ n’a qu’à voir, comment le Cardinal du
 ‘ Perron & M. Arnauld ont prouvé, qu’il ne
 ‘ s’ensuit pas de ce que les pères auroient crû
 ‘ la transubstantiation, qu’ils n’auroient pû ni
 ‘ dû s’exprimer, comme ils ont fait dans les
 ‘ passages, que ceux de la religion objectent.
 ‘ C’est expliquer les choses presque aussi heu-
 ‘ reusement que l’on explique les phénomènes
 ‘ des cieux dans le systeme de Ptolomée. Il
 ‘ y a des Protestans, qui sans être de l’opinion
 ‘ des

' des Lutheriens, sont persuadés d'ailleurs,
 ' que s'il ne s'agit que de faire des hypothèses,
 ' celle de la confession d'Augsbourg est préfé-
 ' rable à toutes les autres, pour ce qui est de
 ' donner raison des phrases de l'antiquité. Car
 ' tout de même que les expressions les plus
 ' opposées touchant Jesus Christ se reconcili-
 ' ent en semble, dans nulle ombre de contra-
 ' diction, des qu'on suppose, qu'il est Dieu &
 ' homme en unité de personne, de même l'on
 ' accordera aisément ensemble tous les termes,
 ' empuelles, hyperboliques, simples & naïfs,
 ' qui se trouvent dans les pères, au sujet de
 ' sacrement, ou les accordera dis-je ensemble,
 ' pourvû qu'on suppose qu'il y a là tout à la
 ' fois l'humanité de Jesus Christ & la substance
 ' du pain.'

The Fathers have spoken so differently of the
 Eucharist, that one may compare their Ex-
 pressions to the Phænomena of Nature, or the
 cœlestial Phænomena, that Part of Physick
 which divides Men the most into Parties, and
 exposeth Mens Minds the most to Conjectures
 and Suppositions. How many Systems have
 they not made to give a reasonable Account of
 those Appearances? and that which is most
 rare, is this, that they find a Defence for all
 those Appearances, only with this Difference,
 that one is incumbered with more, the other
 with less Difficulty. The Doctrine of the
 Fathers, in relation to the Eucharist, hath
 obtained the like Destiny: One can under-
 stand

stand only the Phænomena, that is to say, the different Phrases, which they have left us in their Books; and the Question is to discover the Thoughts which lie couched under those Expressions; for which Purpose Parties are formed, and Hypotheses invented, Transubstantiation is one, Impanation is another, another is that whereby a Figure is defended; and one may find Reason in all these different Systems, if it be so, that a Person hath but Learning and Genius to render an Account for all those Appearances. One need only to observe, how Cardinal *Perron* and M. *Arnauld* have proved, that it doth not follow from thence, that because the Fathers believed Transubstantiation, that they could not, nor ought not to express themselves as they have done, in those Passages, which they of the reformed Religion object. It is almost as easy to explain these Things, as they explain the Phænomena of the Heaven according to the System of *Ptolomy*. There are some Protestants, who, without being of the Opinion of the *Lutherans*, are nevertheless persuaded, that if they are about forming Hypotheses, that of the Confession of *Ausburg* is most preferable to all others, which is to give a Reason of the Phrases of Antiquity. For in the same Manner, that Expressions the most opposite touching Jesus Christ are reconciled with each other, without the least Shadow of Contradiction, by supposing that he is God and Man in the

the Unity of Person, in the same Manner they reconcile easily together all hard Terms, half Words, hyperbolical, simple, and native, which are found among the Fathers, upon the Subject of the blessed Sacrament. They may reconcile them, I say, together, if they will but consider, that our Faith, in this Respect, comprehends both the Humanity of Jesus Christ, and the Substance of the Bread.

The fourth Rule which Mr. *l'Arroque* lays down, whereby to examine the Sayings of the Fathers is, 'La quatrieme regle, que l'on doit
' suivre, pour bien interpreter les temoinages
' des peres, est de ne les pas faire combattre
' contre eux-mêmes, & de ne les pas jetter
' dans une contradiction, car il faut supposer,
' qu'ils ont été assez prudents, & assez judicieux
' pour ne se pas contra dire, & pour se mettre
' à couvert d'une reproache qu'on n'eut man-
' que de leur faire, si cela leur etoit arrive.'
The fourth Rule which we ought to follow, for the well interpreting the Testimonies of the Fathers, is not to make them oppose one another, nor to introduce them, as contradictory to each other; for it is necessary to suppose that they are prudent and judicious enough not to contradict each other, and to expose themselves to a Reproach, which they would not fail to charge them with, if they should chance so to do. But he might have added, if this could be without transgressing the Rule of Truth, which, if it appeared plainly, no human Authority could invalidate it.

An

ERRATA and ADDENDA, *in the System of Divinity.*

CHAP. I. Page 6, Col. 2, Line 25, *after* the general Resurrection, *read* related by Rabbi Saadiah, Abarbenel determined that it would be in the last Generation of all.

Ibid. l. 49, *after* the Day of Judgment, *read* which, he says, will be in some Day of the Resurrection and the Reign of the House of David, which go before it, will be דשני נאלף, in the sixth Millenary, or sixth thousand Years, &c.

Ibid. l. 60, *read* that the Resurrection would be after the Freedom.

P. 7, Col. 1, l. 16, *after the Words* forty Years *after* it, *read* he says the Days of the Messiah to Israel are forty Years; like as it is said forty Years long it will grieve me of the People.

Ibid. l. 17, *after* seventy, *read* as it is said, Esai. xxiii. 15. And it shall come to pass in that Day, that Tyre shall be forgotten seventy Years, according to the Days of one King; after the End of seventy Years shall Tyre sing as an Harlot. Who is this singular King? King Messias.

Ibid. *after the Words* a learned Jew, *read* says Israel will not have a Messiah, since they received him under Hezekiah; which R. Juda

thus interprets, to wit, according to the Opinion of *Eliezer*, the Resurrection will not be presently after the bringing again of *Israel* out of Banishment, but after the Messiah hath reigned forty Years; by the Opinion of *Elesar*, after he hath reigned seventy; in the Opinion of Rabbi, after he hath reigned two or three Ages.

Ibid. l. 23, *after the Words* by them mentioned, *read* therefore, whereas he said, there will not be a Messiah, he means, there will not be Days of the Messiah, in which he will reign upon the Earth before the Resurrection; and whilst he said they received the Messiah under *Hezekiah*, he means, that all that temporal Prosperity, &c.

Ibid. l. 39, *read* Hence it is manifest, that it was neither heretical or blasphemous to affirm, among the *Jews* themselves, either that a Messiah was not to be expected any more on Earth, or at least that he was expected by them without the Pomp of an earthly Kingdom.

P. 7, Col. 2, l. 9, *dele* and Souls of the Dead.

P. 9, *after* l. 3. Col. 2, *read* This Opinion of *D. Kimchi*, where he says, the Sense of the Prophet *Malachi* is, that he will send the Soul of *Elias*, which is gone into Heaven, into a Body which will be created like his former Body, is falsely by *Abarbenel* charged upon the Christians, *i. e.* saying there are some of the Learned among them, who affirm, that Bodies new raised will not be composed of Contraries,

traries, will be airy, slender, light ; and others say they will be of the same Nature with celestial Bodies. That the later Doctors of the Christians think, they who were dead can be said the same with them who are raised, no otherwise than with respect to the Soul ; but as to Bodies, that they will be of a new Composition. That the Resurrection will be only with respect to the Soul, the which is to be brought again, that it may be united with a Body contrary from that which perished after it first was.

Which yet is his own Opinion, when he says, p. 116, That God will create a-new at that Time for every Man Bodies like their former, in Quantity, Quality, Temperament, Disposition of Members wholly the same, which should be fashioned for the same Souls for which the former were ; inasmuch, that since Manners follow the Temperament of the Body, they in nothing differ from them. And seeing that they consist of Matter quite like the former, it is truly affirmed, that the same in Number, Proportion and Parts, arise. To confirm or facilitate which, he brings what is delivered down by the Rabbins concerning the Bone in the Head.

But he is confuted by *M. B. J.* one of his own Clan. As much as it seems to me, this Error is not unlike the former ; for be it so, that a Body endowed with the same Form and Figure is restored, yet it ceases not to be
another

another Body in Parts, like as Statues wrought exquisitely by an Artist, wholly of the same Form and Figure, cannot be called one and the same Statue in Number. Add, since the End of the Resurrection is, that the same Body joined to the Soul should be rewarded or punished for its Deeds, who sees not that cannot be done, if the Body be new and contrary in Number?

P. 32, Col. 1, l. 32, *read* offended.

Ibid. Col. 2, l. 44, *read* Strangers.

P. 202, l. 20, *read* Ἀνάσσειν.

CHAP. IV. P. 1, Col. 1, l. 1, *read* flee.

P. 6, Col. 2, l. 9, *read* who know.

Ibid. l. 10, *read* Persians.

P. 7, Col. 2, l. 5, *dele* the.

P. 8, Col. 1, l. 19, *dele* Impudence.

Ibid. l. 25, *read* are certain Motions.

P. 10, Col. 2, l. 1, *read* Mahometans.

Ibid. l. 15, *dele* the.

To the Explication of some Articles.

P. 111. l. 27, *read* of Names.

P. 107, l. 5, *read* ἱερεὺς.

P. 120, l. 14, *read* Telephoras.

P. 222, l. 28, *read* Hypotheses.

EXP. P. 42, l. 25, *read* of St. Luke.

P. 81, l. 14, *read* Choice.

P. 95, l. 6, *read* This is an Argument that we should give all Diligence to renounce Sin, and to believe the Doctrines, and practise the Duties, &c. 24 OC 62

A N

I N D E X,



Principal Matters contained in this
System of Divinity, and Exposition
of the Articles of Religion.

*The Figures mark'd thus, †, refer to the first
Part, ending at Page 58. Those that are bare
to the remaining Part of the Book. Those
thus, E, and every Number above 58, to the
Exposition of the Articles. Those, ||, to the
Notes.*

A.

ADAM, why not ashamed of his Nakedness,
proved by the Example of *Saul*, 1 *Sam.* xix.
24. Page 9†

Actions, why God is said to chuse or reject Per-
sons antecedently to them,

Altar, none properly, according to *Origen*, 51†.

The chief, what, *ibid.*

Angels, evil and good, taken notice of in sacred
and prophane Authors, 4, 5. Good are Guar-
dians to us, 3. Fallen retain a Power to afflict

G g

and

I N D E X.

and seduce Mankind, what, 3, 4.	Concerned
in the Report of the Resurrection,	72E
Angelic Virtue, what,	12†
Anticipations not to be feigned,	155
Antitypes, the Oblations so called by <i>Damascene</i>	
before Consecration only, who contradicts him-	
self, <i>Genadius</i> , and all Antiquity,	182
<i>Arians</i> , the Word used against them,	21
Apostolical Form of Consecration, <i>St. Basil's</i> Op-	
inion concerning it, 98E, contradictory to that	
of <i>Phurnes</i> ; and <i>Proclus</i> and <i>Chrysostom</i> , that it	
was long, 102; the latter agreeable but to some	
Churches, 102E, 104, 196; that of Apostolical	
Men,	104E
Apostles and their Successors differed from each	
other in their Prayers of the Mysteries, <i>ibid.</i>	
Their Evidence of the Appearances of Christ	
consistent, 66 to 68. The Account of the eu-	
charistical Form in the Apostolic Constitutions	
not agreeable to theirs, a Notion of <i>Dr. Hicks's</i> ,	
confuted, 202, 203. See Consecration.	
Argument, the great,	6†
Articles, a Collection,	195
Ἄρτον ἐπίστατον, how explained by the Fathers,	126
<i>Athenagoras's</i> Opinion and Answer to the Heathens	
concerning Sacrifices and Oblations,	52†
Auricular Confession and Absolution a detestable	
Error in the Church of <i>Rome</i> , proved,	210
<i>Athanasius's</i> Defence of the catholic Doctrine,	21E
Augmentation and Assumption maintained by <i>Ÿ.</i>	
<i>Damascene</i> ,	179E, 184
Ascensions frequent, the Notion excluded,	63
<i>Austin</i> , his Doctrine of the Consecration, 107. Of	
the Trinity,	20E

I N D E X.

B.

- BONA**, Cardinal, blames *Nicholas Cabasilas*,
 and why, 105. The latter vindicated from
 the Canon of the Mass, *ibid.* The Cardinal an-
 swers, 106. The Use of the Prayer and Invoca-
 tion, according to him and others, explained,
 144, 145, &c. Refuted, 147, and 136. His
 Opinion that the Consecration or Transubstan-
 tiation depends on the Intention of the Priest,
 to pronounce the Words, *This is my Body*, in
 the Person of another, *i. e.* of Christ, and not
 his own. The Determination of the *Trent* Coun-
 cil doubted by *Scotus*, 113. And that the Words,
This is my Blood, consecrate the Blood, *ibid.*
 For the Evangelists do not agree in the Form,
 and the Church Form is not reported by them,
 nor conformable to the Form of the *Greeks*,
 114, &c. That the Words are necessary, but
 not alone, 114
 Bread and Wine passes three Honours, 39†
Bessarion changes *St. Chrysostom's* Liturgy to serve
 his own Purpose, 104
Burnet, Bishop, his Account of a first and second
 Review of the Liturgy, 194, 195

C.

- CALVINISTICAL** Doctrine of the Eucharist,
 193. Of Predestination and Election re-
 futed, 87, 88, 89
 Ceremonies, indifferent, not to be enjoined as ne-
 cessary Duties, 31†. Why *St. Clement* refers
 them to the Command of our Lord, *ibid.*
 A Difference between them, and what *St. Paul*

I N D E X.

- delivers as his Command, 31†. Those who neglect them not to be branded with an Anathema, ibid.
- Christ being raised, will raise his Brethren, 202.
- Gave Power to remit and retain Sins upon Conditions, and what, 210. His Resurrection prov'd by such Witnesses as neither could or would deceive us, 43E, 44
- Change or Corruption of the sacred Writings impossible, 55, 56
- Chrism compared to the eucharistical Bread, 139
- Clemens Alexandrinus* explains *John* vi. 51. of the Eucharist, 199, and *Athanasius*, 202, and *Proclus*, 102
- Clemens Romanus*, *Photius's* Objection against him, 122, a Proof of the Genuineness of his second Epistle, ibid.
- Confession of Sins to God only necessary, 215.
- Directions in some Cases to confess to the Minister, and what, 214
- Coen*, by what Words rendered in the *Greek*, 162
- Communion physical and moral, what, 192
- Contrition, how commuted, and Sin forgiven without it; this proved to be false Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, 209, 210
- Covel*, Doctor, confutes *Arcudius* from an old Inscription, which interprets the Phrase *Thine of Thine*, 40†. That confirmed by the Words following, and by *Irenæus*, *ibid.* Bodily Presence mentioned by him in an *Italian* Distich, and his Confutation of it in a Story, 177. Proves a Self-contradiction upon *Meletius Syrigius*, 183.
- His Account of the Prayer of Proposition, 36†.
- Proves a spiritual Change only meant by it, *ib.*
- Difference that the *εὐχή προσκοινωνίας*, Prayer of Oblation,

I N D E X.

Oblation, is the first Oblation postponed from the Oblation, 36†. Explains the Phrase *Thine of Thine*, 40†

Council at *Constantinople* decrees the Eucharist the only Image Christ appointed A. D. 754. Council at *Nice* repealed the former Decree A. D. 788. and Image Worship established by it, 180, 181

Consecration, various Opinions and Disputes in what Words it did consist, 97. No set Form prescribed, that of our Saviour, 99. He left every Church to the Liberty of the Choice of such Form of Consecration, as best suited them, 101. That confined, *ibid.* *Erasmus* and *Basnage* with one had been left, *ibid.* That of the Apostles, 102. Of the *Latin* and *Greek* Church, and the Fathers, 107. Five Kinds of Consecration among the Ancients, essential or accessory, mediate or immediate, 117, &c. Two-fold according to *St. Chrysostom*, as to God, and to Man, 106. Eastern and Western Churches consecrated with Prayers for a thousand Years, 106. The *Greeks* Opinion reconciled with the Fathers, and the Fathers together, upon this Point, 107. Divers Opinions concerning the Manner of the Consecration of Christ and the Churches, in the Church of *Rome*, 109—116, & seq. *Scotus*'s Decision of some Disputes among the *Romanists* about it, 113. The Words of Institution necessary to it, but not alone, 115. The Lord's Prayer used therein, not as tending to the Consecration, 127. By the Sign of the Cross, dipping the Bread, Infusion of warm Water, 128, 129. The Psalms and Hymns used therein derived from the *Jewish* Rite of the Paschal Hymn sung in the primitive Church, 117.

Matt.

I N D E X.

Matt. xxvi. 30. and *Mark* xiv. 26. interpreted of it, 117. Whence supposed to be taken, 119. The eucharistical Hymn a Proof of the Divinity of Christ, 121. Confirms the Proofs of the iid and cxtb Pſalms, 123, & ſeq. The Word μεταβάλλων, *changing*, or μεταβαλὼν, *thou haſt changed*, uſed therein in the *Greek* Liturgies, explained by *Leo Allatius*, and his Explication confuted, 136, 137. The Confession of the *Greeks* in the Council of *Florence*, that the Prayer to make the Bread the Body of Chriſt contributes not to the Conſecration, but is, that it might be ſanctified to us and our Salvation, argued by the *Romaniſts*, 143, 144. The Argument refuted, *ibid.* Proved that it is not to be referred to thoſe following, 136. That the Change is made by it, or Conſecration, 135, condemned as a deteſtable Error by *Bona* and others, 105. The Answer of four Biſhops to Pope *Eugenius* opposed by other *Greeks*, 144. Not given in the Name of all the *Greeks*, nor agreed to be inſerted in the Definitions of the Council, *ibid.* nor *Bessarion's*, 142. The Emperor agrees not to have it inſerted, *ibid.* He and the Emperor ſeign a Conſent, 141. The *Latins* inſert the Answer in the Reſolution of the Synod ὁρθῶς, 142. See Invocation.

Corban, the Word mentioned *Mark* vii. 11. explained, 28†. Different Forms thereof, *ibid.* and 29. They conſecrated not to God by it, proved by Example, the ſame with δῶρον, and ודן, *aſſur*, forbidden, a Vow explained, 29†

Cranmer, Biſhop, his Doctrine, 193

I N D E X.

D.

- D**ÆMONS, Heathen, as what worshipped,
and what indeed, 2†, 3, 4, 5. More noble
free from Bodies, 3†. Our Guardians, *ibid.*
and 4
- Dagon*, a Goddess of the *Egyptians*, the same with
Venus, *Astarte*, *Naamah*, *Europa*, *Atergatis*, *Dor-*
ceto, *Astoreth*, 4, 5
- Damascene*, *John*, his Opinion of the Presence of
Christ in the Eucharist, 179. Compares it with
the Bread mentioned *Dan.* i. 12, 13. 180. Holds
two Substances therein, and how united, *ibid.*
Guilty of a Self-contradiction, 182. Interprets
the Word *Ἀντίτυπον*, 182, 342
- Deities, Heathen, two Accounts of their Descent,
two different Orders of them, what the Offices
of each, 3†, 4. Proved not to be good, 4†, 5.
- Dimissory Supper, *Scaliger's* Notion, 2†
- Dionysius's* Account of administering the Eucharist
translated, 174. Mentions no Oblation or In-
vocation, *ibid.*
- Discipline of the Church with regard to Commu-
nicants settled, and an Irregularity rectified, 212
213
- Doxologies prove the Trinity, 16E

E.

- E**BIONITES and *Cerinthians* adopt the *Gnostick*
Notions, 200. Reproached by *Ignatius*, *ibid.*
- Election not absolute, grounded upon the Cove-
nant, 89E, therefore conditional, *ibid.* To make
the Decree of Election antecedent to the Cove-
nant a fundamental Mistake, 87
- Eucharist,

I N D E X.

Eucharist, the Doctrine of it pointed by the Fathers against the Heresies, 197, 198, 199. The Lord's Prayer used therein three Times, 127, 128. Imitates the Feasts on *Jewish* Offerings, 2†. Its Rites, those of the Paschal Feast, 2†, 3. Eucharistical Rites transferred from *Jewish*, 2†. Hymns a Proof of the Divinity of Christ, 121

F.

FATHERS not always decisive, but clear as far as they go, 222. Their Expressions compared to the celestial Appearances, *ibid.* These explained according to the different Systems of Astronomy, as the Sense is given of the Phrases of the Fathers concerning the Eucharist, according to the different Hypotheses on that Subject, *ibid.*
 Food, a Right of using any sort given to *Noah* and his Posterity 30†, 31. When God first forbade some, and why, 31†. The Prohibition not universal, to be abolished, and why, *ibid.*
 Flesh of a Beast that died of itself not lawful for the *Israelites* to eat of it, but for the Inhabitants, *ibid.*
 First-fruits, none to be offered at God's Altar, 25†, 26. Some barely permitted to be offered, not before the third Century, *ibid.* By the third Apostolical Canon, *ibid.* Those who transgressed it deposed, 25†. Some others permitted by the fourth, how distinguished from Bread and Wine, 26†. Tithes, and the most excellent of Fruits so called, and why, 26, 27. Offered apart with particular Forms of Benediction, 25. What offered by the Fifth, 26. A Corruption condemned, *ibid.*
Fruits

I N D E X

Fruits of our Lips, the Original of it, *Heb.* xiii. 15.
 καρπὸν, a Translation of the *Hebrew* of *Hof.* xiv.
 2. ונשלמה פרים שפתינו If the LXX. had a
 Copy wanting פ, and read פרי, Fruits, quære,
 if καρπὸν be the same with ἀρπάζμα and ἀρπάζεις,
 Holocaust and Oblation, according to the LXX.
 which consisting of Heifers, if פרים may not be
 rendered by it, 29†. Denied by Mr. *Pfaffius*,
Note in S. Iren. Fragm. Anecd. 119. who calls
 it a Translation of *Isai.* lvii. 18, 19. אשלם, in
 Ver. 18, and Ver. 19, נוב שפתיים, and the first
 Word of *Hof.* xiv. 2. ונשלמה פרים, to join the
 two Things disjoined in the Passage of *Isaiab.* 29†
 Fruits, Summer, of the Altar, Holocausts called
 by that Name by the Rabbins, and why, *ibid.*
 Money in the Treasury for the Use of the Tem-
 ple, to the Summer Fruits of the Altar, *ibid.*
 Beasts bought offered instead of Vows, *ibid.*
 Future World, what, 17†

G.

GAN Eden, what, 17†
 Gifts or Oblations, the same offered by Pa-
 gans, which were by *Jews* and Christians, 1
Gnosticks, their Doctrine of two Gods and two
 Christs, 200 to 204. Confuted by *Irenæus*, *ibid.*
 God, one only true God, a pure, intelligent, in-
 visible and incomprehensible Being, originally
 believed and worshipped by all Nations, 3
 Graces which denominate Christian Actions are
 three, 53†. Grace of God, what, 81. Grace
 does all, 85 to 87. Given upon Conditions,
ibid. Means must be used to obtain it. Refused,
 neglected, or abused, withdrawn, 90

H h

H.

I N D E X.

H.

- H**EATHEN Religion, its Defects, 6. Ex-
ceptions against Miracles brought to prove
it, 8
Ἱερεῖα, *Hiereia*, Victims killed for Sacrifice, or to
be eaten, so called, 45†
Holy Days, why instituted, 31†
Holy Ghost, his Divinity proved, 15E
Hicks, Doctor, his Explanation of the Texts in
Proof of the eucharistical Oblations, 154, &c.
Refuted.
Hymn. See Consecration.
Hymns and Doxologies celebrating the Divinity
of Christ against Heresies, objected as a Crime
by Hereticks against Christians, 122

I.

- I**DEAS clear and distinct, not the sole Foun-
dation of our Reasoning. None of things du-
bious and obscure. Our Knowledge depends not
on them, E23, 24, 25
Jewish Passover, our Lord did not celebrate it, 1†
Wherein his Supper was like, and wherein it
differed from it, 1†, 2. Why not eaten till after
a Feast, 2†. Christ's Institution no Part of it,
3†, but another Custom, *ibid.* When the Pre-
paration for it, 1†
Jews, ancient, believed the Trinity, 7E, 8
Ignatius's Proofs of the Genuineness of his Epistles,
121, 122. Blames the *Ebionites* and *Cerinthians*
for denying the spiritual Presence, 200
Invocation of Saints, an Error condemned in the
Church of *Rome*, 48†, 6
Invocation

I N D E X.

- Invocation Prayer, Want of it objected against the
English Liturgy, 170. The Liturgy vindicated,
 ibid. Struck out in the second reviewed Liturgy
 by the Council of *Bucer* and *Martyr*, changed
 for others, both joined by Archbp. *Laud*, 42†.
 Rejected in the Synod of *Glasgow*, A. D. 1637.
- Invocation Form, the Reason for striking it out,
 116. Invocation of the Holy Ghost upon the
 eucharistical Elements was in all the *Greek* Li-
 turgies, and in the most noted Liturgies of the
 Western Church, the Consecration by them
 ascribed to the Invocation of the Holy Ghost,
 and Prayer, 130, 133, 135, 151, 167. Not in
 the *Roman Canon*, but one to the same Purpose,
 168. *Irenæus* the first who mentions it, ibid.
Justin Martyr says nothing of it, 169, nor *Dio-
 nysius the Areopagite*, 172, 173. Only a moral
 Change prayed for by it, proved from that used
 in Baptism, and Chrism in extreme Unction,
 138, 139, 140
- Irenæus* blames the *Gnosticks*, 204. Why he says
 our Flesh is nourished with the Body and Blood
 of Christ, 131, 202, 204. A Passage from
 him explained differently by the *Lutherans* and
 Divines of the Church of *England*, 203, 204
- Judgments, three which God exerciseth; Judg-
 ment Day, three Classes of Men then, 15†, 16.
- Judgment Universal, *R. N.* his Description of
 it and the two others, 17†. *Samuel* feared it was
 come, 16
- Justin Martyr*, his Age deviates from the Aposto-
 lic, 171. Mentions no Oblation, 169

INDEX

K.

KEYS, the Power of them, to whom given,
212, 213, &c.
Kingdom of Christ spiritual, proved, 47E—*50,
51, 52, &c.

L.

LITURGIES, when first used in particular
Forms, 172. Made extempore, *ibid.*
Liberty, Christian, taken away by Moderns, we
required to stand in it, 314
Luther began the Reformation, 191
Lutheran Doctrine, 190

M.

MARCUS the Heretick imitates the officiating Minister, 172
Mal. i. 10, 11, his pure Offering, how diversely explained, 47†, 48, 44, 153
 Messenger of Satan, 5
Moloch, his Descent, different Names, from whence, worshipped for Fear, 4. And a good God *A-malek* to prevent his Effects, *ibid.*
Mosaic Covenant, the Observance of it a Condition of eternal Life, 4†. In the latter a future State not clearly revealed, *ibid.* and why, 6†
Mosaic Law divided into three Parts, 28†
 Mysteries, divine, not to be rejected, because incomprehensible, 26E

N.

I N D E X.

N.

NICEPHORUS illustrates the Change by Example, 131

O.

OBLATION, new, taught by Christ, consisted in Blessing and Thanksgiving and Prayer, whereby we offer, dedicate, and consecrate to God the Gifts given us of him, *i. e.* the First-fruits, or the best and most excellent; and beg of him to sanctify them to our Use, and that he would make them the Sacraments of his Body and Blood, 2†, 39, 40, 153, 154

Oblation three-fold, 33†. The first not essential to the Eucharist, nor used in all Churches, 34†. Proofs that it was not by the Ancients esteemed necessary, from their Liturgies without it, *ibid.* Laick and sacerdotal Forms thereof in the *Latin* Liturgies, *ibid.* *Ignatius* and *Origen* mention not the first, *ibid.* Forms of it in the *Greek* Liturgies, where the Minister prayed for Offerers, and those for whom they offered, 35†. *Arcudius* and *Goar's* Accounts of them agree with that of *Gabriel Severus*, but differ a little, 39†. At the first Christ is slain, his Portion pierced the second a Sacrifice of Praise; at the third the Body and Blood of Christ are offered, as represented under the Species of Bread and Wine, *ib.* We offer *Thine of Thine*, not we offer to thee *thy Christ* in Sacrifice, explained by the following Words, 39†, 40. *Goar* confutes himself in his Explication, *ibid.* To offer *λατρεία*, not the Lord slain, 40†. *Bp. Patrick's* Account of the two former,

I N D E X.

former, and proves them to be in our Service, 36†. See Sacrifice.

Oblation, eucharistical, by *Irenæus* referred to the second Constitutions of the Apostles, instituted by them in the Churches, which were collected out of the *Jews* or the *Jewish* Churches only, as an indifferent Rite, and why, 31†. No other Rite of Oblation in the ancient Church, but of Gifts to be consecrated, *ibid.* An Oblation of Bread and Wine by Apostolical Men, and of the ancient Christians with Prayers, not received every where, 24†, 25, 30, 31. *Irenæus* reconciled with St. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* xi. 34. and vii. 6. 10, 12, 25. 2 *Thes.* ii. 15. and with himself, 27† Oblation, or Sacrifice eucharistical of the New Testament taught by our Lord, wherein it consisted, 153. According to *Irenæus*, not in the external Rite, 154. In what Sense not denied, *ibid.* Argued from *Matt.* v. 23, 24. and other Passages of Scripture, *ibid.* Replied to, 156, & seq.

P.

PERSON, what, 17E

Pfaffius, his Objection against *Irenæus*, proving the Resurrection of the Just from the Eucharist, answered, 205, 206

Plato's Doctrine of the Trinity, 9E

Prayers which the *Jews* used for the Dead, 13†

Prayers at the Sepulchre of the Pious, by whom, and why, 8†. Prayer, the Excellency thereof, 47†, 48. Prayers to Saints, their Vanity, &c. proved, *ibid.* The Church of *Rome* guilty of offering them, 3, 4

Predestination, absolute, its Uncharitableness, 87E

Priest,

I N D E X.

Priest, High, a Type of Christ, 48||
 Priest, the Word of a two-fold Meaning, 53†, 54,
 &c. All Christians called Priests, and why, *ibid.*
 Publick Worship, the first Account of it was of
 its being offered before the Law, and after the
 Flood, by way of Sacrifice, *ibid.* 43†
 Psalm xxxiii. when read, 117

R.

RESURRECTION, general, why more clearly
 delivered in the Gospel than the Law, 6†.
 The Opinion of the *Jews* when it will be.
 From what Passages of the Old Testament pro-
 ved, 4†. Identity of Bodies at the Resurrection
 denied by *D. Kimchi* in a Comment on *Mal.* iv. 5.
 confuted, see Addenda. Luz, the Bone in the
 Brain of a Man, in the Place of the Medulla
 Spina Dorfi, or in the lower Part or Extremity
 of it, belonging to the Coccygis, joined to the
 Extremity of the Os Sacrum, the Foundation
 of the Resurrection, not to the Just, 7†, 8. A
 Prophecy thereof, *ibid.*
 Reason, the Use of it in Religion, 20E. The
 Doctrine of the Trinity does not contradict it,
 23E, 24
 Reign of the Messiah on Earth, 7†. Whence, and
 from what Texts of Scripture conjectured, and
 when, *ibid.* Denied by some *Jews* to be a fun-
 damental, *ibid.* See Addenda.
 Reward, four Times of receiving it, 8†
 Rise, four different Opinions concerning those who
 rise, 10†

S.

I N D E X.

S.

SACRAMENTS, what, 217
 Sabbath, the Precept of it universal, 32†.
 The Precept and Reason of it two-fold, Death
 to transgress the latter Precept, *ibid.* Delive-
 rance from *Egypt* the Reason of the Law of the
 Sabbath of Rest, *ibid.* Not universal, a Sign,
ibid. Proved by Instances,
 Saints. See Invocation.
 Sacrifices distinguished into the Administration and
 the Thing offered, 45†. *Jewish*, of various
 Kinds, how, and why offered, 44†. How it
 agrees with, or differs from Oblation, *ibid.*
 What the primary and secondary Signification
 of the Word, 45†, 46. Literally and figura-
 tively what, *ibid.* *Jewish* Sacrifices not offered
 on a Day of Sadness, and why, 47†. Why in-
 stituted, 48†. In their Nature indifferent, and
 why abolished, 49†. Prophecies that they should,
ibid. *Jewish* Mediums of Prayer, *ibid.* To
 whom only permitted. Prayer the only perfect
 and acceptable, 50†. Properly so called, no
 other in the New Testament but that of Christ
 upon the Cross, *ibid.* Sacrifice of the Mass ab-
 surd and impious, 57†
 Sacrifice, the Memorial of Christ's, offered, *ibid.*
 A Notion of Dr. *Hicks*, confuted, 148, &c.
 Sacrifice, the Sacrament so called by Ancients and
 Moderns, and why, 160, &c. The chief, most
 eminent, excellent, real, the Sacrifice of a con-
 trite Heart, and an external, material Sacrifice so
 called promiscuously by Dr. *Hicks*, 165, 166, 167.
 Argument from *Tertullian* to prove it, 154, 161.
 From St. *Paul*'s Allusion to it, *Rom.* xv. 15, 16.
 163.

I N D E X.

163. Only Sacrifices signify the Excellence of the spiritual Sacrifices not in the exclusive Sense, 165. The Service only properly the Sacrifice, 164, 166. Proper material Sacrifice, 195. Three Kinds of spiritual Sacrifices recommended by *Gregory Nazianzen*, 164. Carnal ones Types of Christ, 43†
- Sibon*, King of *Heshbon*, his Case, 36
- Sadducees, their Doctrine, whence imbibed, 5†. Enmity between them and other *Jews*, confuted by our Saviour. Reckoned the worst of Men, *ibid.*
- Spirit, false Pretences to the Spirit, and the ill Consequences of it, 80. Signs to know where the true Spirit of God dwells, *ibid.*
- Spirits, evil, what Evil proceeds from them, 4

T.

- T**ERTULLIAN for the Trinity, 11E
- Theodoritus*, his Saying applied, 147
- Tithes, paying them a Precept which Christ came not to destroy, but enlarge, reckoned First-fruits in a lesser valuable Portion, 26†. The Precept of paying them, understood by divine Revelation or universal Tradition, approved by Christ, 1 *Cor.* ix. 14. 27†. Reasons of it given Apost. Can. Book ii. c. 25. and by *Milton*, 26†, 27
- Transubstantiation, where and when sown. Grows in 400 Years, 180, 181. Defined, 184. The History of it, *ibid.* Thrown off by the Doctrine of *Luther*, 185. *Rhadbertus* the Author of it in the *Latin Church*, 190, and who in the *Greek*, 181. *Calvin* and *Zuinglius* make a farther Step, but differ from each other, and from *Luther*, 191, 193

I N D E X.

V *ES*OVIS, the Sun, a *Roman* God, 6

W.

WORSHIP paid to God, both as Creator
and Redeemer, 47†. Religious Worship,
what, 4
Will, free to do Good or Evil, proved from Scrip-
ture, 77, 78, 79

Z.

ZUINGLIUS causeth *Luther's* Writings to
be distributed among his Disciples, 191.
Wherein his Doctrine differs from that of *Lu-*
ther, 24 OC 62 ibid.

F I N I S.